

Ranjit Singh and another Vs Surinder Kaur and another

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: May 17, 2006

Acts Referred: Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) â€” Section 34, 406

Hon'ble Judges: Mehtab S. Gill, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: A.S. Kalra, for the Appellant; Rajnish Malhotra, Advocate Mr. S.S. Randhawa, Senior DAG, Punjab, for the Respondent

Judgement

Mehtab S. Gill, J.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that an FIR was registered against the petitioners under Sections 307 and

498-A read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station Ahmedgarh by respondent No.1. As per judgment (Annexure P2), the petitioners were

acquitted. A frivolous complaint under Sections 406/34 IPC was filed during the pendency of the case under Sections 307 and 498-A read with

Section 34 IPC.

2. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 has stated that Section 406 IPC is an independent Section. The complaint fulfils all the ingredients and

now evidence is being led before the that Court.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the petition with their assistance.

4. Ranjit Singh (petitioner No. 1) is father-in-law and Nirmal Kaur (petitioner No.2) is mother-in-law of respondent No. 1. Demand of dowry has

been made and specific entrustment has been alleged in the complaint. I would not like to go into the merits of the case at this stage, as it may

affect the trial. Though specific entrustment has been alleged in the complaint to both the petitioners, it only seems that they have been arrayed as a

party along with the husband of respondent No. 1 only to harass them. Complaint qua petitioners Ranjit Singh and Nirmal Kaur is quashed and all

consequential proceedings are also set aside.

With the above direction, petition is disposed of as such.