

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
243 CRR-550-2022(O&M)
Date of decision: 16.08.2023

Paramjit Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

Satnam Singh & Others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Nagar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

NIDHI GUPTA, J.

Present revision petition has been filed against the impugned judgment dated 12.12.2019 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, whereby the appeal filed by the petitioner, against the judgment dated 10.06.2019, whereby the learned trial Court has acquitted respondents No.1 to 3, has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was married to respondent No.1 herein on 15.01.2012. One child was born out of this wedlock who is in the care and custody of respondent No.1. Respondent No.2 is the father-in-law, respondent No.3 is mother-in-law, respondents No.6 and 7 are brother-in-law and sister-in-law; respondents No.8 to 10 are sisters-in-law of the petitioner. It is submitted that as the private respondents herein are greedy type of persons, they ill-treated the petitioner for bringing insufficient dowry. The private respondents herein demanded Alto car and cash amount of

Rs.2 lakh. As the petitioner was unable to fulfil their demands, she was turned out of her matrimonial home on 07.05.2015, after being given severe beatings. Accordingly, the petitioner registered complaint under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at the Police Station City Ferozepur.

3. It is further submitted that the private respondents also snatched custody of male child from her which also amounts to mental cruelty and therefore, learned Courts below were in grave error in acquitting the accused.

4. No other argument is raised on behalf of the petitioner.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. Perusal of record reveals that in the application dated 07.05.2015 (Exhibit D2), the complaint made by the petitioner is that she was taken to Ferozepur City by respondent No.1 and was thrown from the motorcycle which was being driven by him. It has also been alleged that respondent No.1 forcibly snatched the minor child from the petitioner and thereafter, neither respondent No.1 nor any of his family members came to the parental house of the petitioner to bring her back. Admittedly, in the said complaint, there is no mention of any demand of dowry by the accused persons. Accordingly, the impugned orders do not suffer from any error as no offence under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC has been made out against the private respondents herein.

7. It has further come on record that after the minor child was allegedly snatched from the petitioner, she lodged a complaint to seek child's custody. The said petition was also dismissed. Admittedly,

even at the time of passing of impugned order dated 10.06.2019, the petitioner had already been granted divorce which has not been challenged by the petitioner till date. It is therefore clear that the petitioner herself did not desire to live with the accused persons. Accordingly, I find no ground is made out to interfere in the concurrent findings of the Courts below. Present petition accordingly stands **dismissed.**

8. Pending application(s) if any also stand(s) disposed of.

16.08.2023

Sunena

(Nidhi Gupta)

Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No