



CRR-2932-2014 (O&M)

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

(216)

CRR-2932-2014 (O&M).
Date of Decision:-27.08.2025.

Ved Kumari

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Ms. Vaishali Kamboj, Advocate and
Ms. Shuchi Sodhi, Amicus Curiae
for the petitioner.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

CRM-28722-2014

For the reasons recorded, the application is allowed as prayed for and the delay of 40 days in filing of the present revision petition stands condoned.

CRR-2932-2014

1. The present revision petition has been preferred against the judgment dated 26.11.2011 passed by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kurukshetra, vide which the accused/respondent Nos.2 and 3 had been acquitted and the judgment dated 09.05.2014 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, vide which the appeal filed by the petitioner has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the Court below has fallen in error in acquitting respondent Nos.2 and 3 despite there being cogent evidence. It is submitted that the petitioner was



CRR-2932-2014 (O&M)

married to respondent No.2-husband on 20.02.1998 and two daughters were born out of the said wedlock. It was further submitted that the complainant faced physical and mental cruelty by the accused due to the demand of dowry and the petitioner was also threatened of being eliminated. The FIR was lodged in the year 2004 and the learned trial Court, vide judgment dated 26.11.2011 acquitted respondent Nos.2 and 3. The appeal filed by the revisionist-petitioner also came to be dismissed. Learned counsel for the revisionist-petitioner has argued that the cogent evidence in terms of the deposition of the petitioner has been negated.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner at length and gone through the impugned judgments.

4. The learned trial Court has examined the entire evidence and the testimonies which reflects inconsistencies in the timeline of the incidents alleged by the petitioner. The petitioner as well as other witnesses failed to give any specific date or time of the alleged harassment and/or the demand of dowry. It has also come in evidence that the mother-in-law was living separately and had a separate ration card also. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to demonstrate as to how the said findings of the learned Courts below are perverse and contradictory to the evidence on record.

5. Finding no merit, the present petition is dismissed.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

August 27, 2025.

S. Sethi

Whether speaking/reasoned:-Yes/No Whether Reportable:-

Yes/No