

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

**CRM-M-39621-2023**

Date of Decision: 21.08.2023

Meena Rani

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Ms. Manpreet Ghuman, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Akshita Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in the present third petition is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.12 dated 01.02.2022, registered under Sections 304-B/34/201 IPC, at Police Station Julkan, District Patiala.

As per facts of the case, a complaint was lodged by Deep Singh, alleging therein that his niece was married on 25.10.2021 as per Sikh rites and ceremonies with Sukhwinder Singh @ Sonu. It was alleged that sufficient dowry was given to the in-laws of his niece at the time of marriage, however, her mother in-law (Meena Rani i.e. petitioner), father-in-law (Tarsem Singh), husband (Sukhwinder Singh) and brother-in-law (Ravi Singh) were consistently demanding more dowry as they were not happy with the dowry already given. They used to harass his niece for the demand of car. Time and again, it was informed by his niece and they tried to make them understand, but they did not. However, on 31.01.2022, they got information that his niece Shobha Kaur has expired. They rushed to the house of her in-laws and found her hanging from the ceiling fan. It was alleged that as his niece was being harassed for the demand of dowry and hence, she was killed by her in-laws. Request was made to take legal action

against the culprits. On the basis of the complaint, a formal FIR was lodged and investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 01.02.2022. She approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala, however, the learned Court after hearing both the sides, dismissed the same vide its order dated 31.08.2022. Aggrieved by the same, on the earlier occasions the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-47182-2022, however, the same was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 21.12.2022 and thereafter by way of filing CRM-M-35768-2023, which was also allowed to be withdrawn on 01.08.2023. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court again by way of filing the present third petition for grant of bail.

It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in this case. She submits that the petitioner is the mother-in-law of the deceased. She submits that the son of the petitioner was only 12<sup>th</sup> pass, whereas, the deceased being graduate was not happy with the marriage and thus, she committed suicide. She submits that the allegations pertaining to the harassment caused on the account of demand of dowry are totally without any basis and even levelled only to harass the petitioner. It is submitted that in all there were four accused named in the FIR, however, during the investigation, brother-in-law of the deceased, namely, Ravi Singh was declared innocent. She submits that the investigation is complete and charges are framed, however, there are 30 prosecution witnesses and none has been examined till date. She submits that whole family of the petitioner is behind bars on the basis of false and frivolous allegations and the petitioner who is not having criminal antecedents, deserves to be enlarged

on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and has submitted that admittedly the marriage had taken place on 25.10.2021 and the deceased committed suicide on 31.01.2022, thus, within three months of the marriage. She submits that as there are specific allegations of harassment caused to the deceased on account of demand of dowry, provisions of Section 113-B Evidence Act are straightway attracted in this case. She submits that as per instructions received from ASI Surinder Singh, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, however, the investigation is complete and charges are framed. She submits that in all there are 30 prosecution witnesses and examination of the same is yet to commence. She submits that in all there are three accused and rest two accused are behind bars.

Heard.

Evidently, the petitioner is behind bars since 01.02.2022. The marriage of the deceased took place on 25.10.2021 and her unnatural death by hanging took place on 31.01.2022. Whether the unnatural death of the deceased is due to harassment on account of demand of dowry, is a subject matter of trial to be decided by the trial Court after appreciation of complete evidence to be led by both the parties before it. Though the investigation is complete, charges are framed and out of total 30 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner has any criminal antecedents. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case, however, considering the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, I am of the view that learned

counsel for the petitioner has been able to make out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. The trial would take sufficiently long time for its conclusion.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.08.2023  
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned  
Whether Reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

: Yes/No  
: Yes/No