



**CRM-M-18334-2024 &
01 connected case**

2

No.51 dated 16.03.2024 registered under Sections 306/34 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sadar Amritsar, District Amritsar.

3. Learned counsel(s) for the petitioners *inter alia* contend that marriage between the son of the petitioners and the deceased took place on 04.12.2016 and in the last 07 years, there was no complaint whatsoever either by the deceased or by the complainant against the petitioners or their son with regard to any maltreatment or atrocity committed upon her by them. Learned counsel(s) submits that the son of the petitioners took the deceased to the hospital and he himself informed the complainant with regard to the admission of the deceased in the hospital and he has paid for her treatment in the hospital. Learned counsel further submits that the deceased was admitted in the hospital on 14.03.2024 expired on 16.03.2024. During these two days, the deceased neither made any statement before the police authorities or before the doctor, nor any dying declaration statement was recorded by the investigating agency and the ingredients of instigation are clearly missing.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has filed short reply dated 21.05.2024 by way of affidavit of Varinder Singh Khosa, PPS Assistant Commissioner of Police, North, Amritsar on behalf of respondent-State, which is taken on record. Copies thereof have been supplied to learned counsel(s) for the petitioners. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the ground that the perusal of the FIR (supra) and the facts of the case clearly indicate that the petitioners compelled the deceased to commit suicide and she was disturbed by their continuous harassment and her death has taken place in the matrimonial home. Moreover, perusal of the post-mortem report indicates that apart from her admission on account of consuming some poisonous substance, there were some injury



CRM-M-18334-2024 & 3
01 connected case

marks on her body as well, which only the petitioners could explain. As such, their custodial interrogation is imperative.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record of the case, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, both the petitions stand dismissed.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed strictly in accordance with law without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

May 23, 2024
manisha (HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |