

219

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-17920-2022

Date of Decision: December 06, 2022

Supreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Sumeet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Karunesh Kaushal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr.Nippun Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

.....

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0066 dated 26.4.2021 registered under Sections 304-B, 498-A, 406, 149 IPC at Police Station, Kartarpur, District Jalandhar Rural.

As per facts of the case, present FIR was lodged by Joga son of Fauja Singh. The allegations in the FIR are that the marriage of Parampal Kaur, who is grand daughter of complainant's sister took place on 25.4.2021 with the petitioner, i.e. Supreet Singh @ Sonu son of Jarnail Singh. It was alleged that sufficient dowry was given in the marriage as per their status. In the morning they received a phone call from Jarnail Singh, i.e. father of the petitioner that they will not keep their daughter. Complainant along with his son Balbir Singh, cousin MC Ram Singh and nephew Amarjit Singh and wife Darshan Kaur reached at the house of in laws of Parampal Kaur, who

told them that petitioner, i.e. her husband Supreet Singh @ Sonu, mother-in-law Jaswinder Kaur @ Santosh Kaur, father-in-law Jarnail Singh and sister-in-law Navjot Kaur were harassing her since night on account of bringing less dowry. She also told that they said that they will not keep her. She further told that she was pushed and was expelled from the matrimonial home and she became unconscious. Thereafter, Parampal Kaur was taken to Sacred Heart Maksuda, Jalandhar for her treatment where the doctor declared her dead. It was alleged that Parampal Kaur died due to harassment caused by her in-laws for bringing insufficient dowry. A request was made to take legal action against the culprits.

The investigation commenced and petitioner-Supreet Singh i.e. husband of the deceased, and her parents-in-law i.e. Jarnail Singh and Jaswinder Kaur @ Santosh Kaur were arrested on 26.4.2021. The petitioner approached learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Jalandhar for grant of bail, however, after hearing the parties, the same was declined vide order dated 16.12.2021. Aggrieved by the same petitioner has approached this court for grant of bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that though in the present case the bride died after one day of the marriage, however, the allegations levelled against the petitioner and co-accused are not at all substantiated. Counsel has drawn attention of this Court to the photographs appended with the petition and also to the medical record of the case. He submits that by no stretch of imagination it can be inferred that within a short span of the marriage the petitioner and co-accused caused any type of harassment or cruelty to the deceased. He

submits that post mortem of the deceased was conducted wherein it is

clearly mentioned in the Histopathological Report that 'No Opinion Possible'. The doctors could not give any specific cause of death in this case. Counsel submits that drawing the conclusion of causing harassment and cruelty within a day of the marriage is totally an injustice to the in-laws. Counsel submits that the death could be even by a heart attack which would be a natural cause of death. It is submitted that petitioner is behind bars since 26.4.2021. Co-accused Jaswinder Kaur @ Santosh Kaur and Jarnail Singh @ Jilla, i.e. mother-in-law and father-in-law, have already been granted regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 02.03.2022 and 20.04.2022. The investigation is already complete and thus the petitioner deserves to be enlarged on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that deceased died on the very next day of the marriage. It is submitted that there are specific allegations of harassment and cruelty on account of bringing insufficient dowry levelled by the complainant. However, State counsel submits that no specific cause of death could be given by the doctors. He submits that presumption under Section 113-B of the Evidence Act is straightway attracted to the present case. It is also acknowledged that petitioner is behind bars since 26.4.2021. State counsel further submits, on instructions from ASI Harvinder Singh that out of 18 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. He however admits the fact that co-accused, i.e. Jaswinder Kaur @ Santosh Kaur and Jarnail Singh @ Jilla, i.e. mother-in-law and father-in-law of the deceased have already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide orders dated 02.03.2022 and 20.04.2022. It is further submitted that there is no cause of death that could be established.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and have gone through the record carefully. The petitioner is the husband of the deceased and is behind bars since 26.4.2021. From perusal of the record it is evident that the bride died on the very next day of the marriage. However, perusal of the medical record shows that no definite cause of death could be ascertained during post mortem of the deceased. Whether the death in the present case is unnatural or not is totally a subject matter to be evaluated by the Trial Court on appreciation of the complete evidence to be led during the trial. However, this Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on merits of the case, at this stage. Investigation in the case is complete and charges have been framed. Out of 18 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time and no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for such a long time. In the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds that counsel for petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of bail to the petitioner.

In the totality of facts and circumstances and without making any observation on merits, present petition is allowed. Petitioner be enlarged on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds subject to satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned. Nothing stated herein shall be treated as an expression on the merits of the case.

December 06, 2022
meenuss

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable ? | Yes/No |