

HRAM030034602012



Presented on: 30-03-2012
Registered on: 30-03-2012
Decided on: 12-08-2026
Duration: 14 years, 4 months, 13 days

FIR no.: 408 dated 05.10.2011.
Police Station: Ambala City
U/Sections: 498A, 406, 323 & 120-B of IPC.

IN THE COURT OF
Judicial Magistrate – 1st Class Ambala,
(Presided Over by Manjeet Pal)

Chi/7726/2013

State

Versus

Ranjan Mehta s/o Mahesh Mehta, all R/o Tanda Road, Ahyapur, Balmiki Mohalla, Tanda Tehsil Dasuya, Distt. Hoshiarpur.

.....Accused

Present: Sh. Vikas Sharma, APP for the State.
Sh. Jasbir Singh, Advocate for complainant.
Accused Ranjan Mehta in custody represented by Sh. Jasdev Saini, Advocate.

JUDGMENT:

The above named accused has been sent up for facing trial by the Station House Officer, Police Station Ambala City for the alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 498A, 406, 323 & 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*hereinafter to be referred in short as "IPC"*).

2. The present prosecution case has been registered on the complaint of complainant Sapna Bhatia who has stated that her marriage

Manjeet Pal, (HR0402),
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Ambala, 12.08.2026

was solemnized with Raman Bhatia on 27.10.2019 in Ambala City with Hindu Rites and rituals and her parents spent a lot of money on this marriage. The mother and brother of the complainant gave a handsome dowry including the Kitty Set Gold, Gold Ring, Gold Chain and valuable clothes along-with cash. Since the solemnization of the marriage, the accused persons were not happy with the dowry articles given at the time of marriage before and after the marriage and started taunting her even on the first day of the marriage by saying that her parents have not given sufficient dowry and a Bike i.e. motorcycle which is mandatory and obligatory in the area and this act of her parents have lowered down the respect of the accused persons in the eyes of society. The accused persons with their common objects to achieve their illegal design taken the entire jewelery/ornaments from the complainant on the pretext of keeping the same in the bank locker. After few days, the accused started coming late in the house and abusing her. The accused persons demanded ₹2,00,000/- from her brother for carrying on business of accused. The accused persons stopped providing the proper food, water and other comfortable and the complainant was confined a dark room. Meantime, the complainant was pregnant and during her pregnancy, the accused persons started beating and misbehaving with the complainant. The mother of the complainant brought ₹20,000/- for delivery of child of complainant and on 09.09.2010 a male child was born in Govt. Hospital and all the accused persons had spent all the money which was given by the mother of the complainant upon their lust, and luxuries and complainant suffered great difficulties,

Manjeet Pal, (HR0402),
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Ambala, 12.08.2026

pain and agony, mental torture for not providing the proper diet and medicines.

3. It is further averred that after the birth of male child, the accused persons who lived in the matrimonial house of complainant, had started multiplying the cruel treatment to the complainant and told the complainant that now liabilities of accused no. 1 and 2 has been increased, so, the complainant should go to her parental home at Ambala and should bring ₹2 lakh. When complainant showed her inability by saying that her father is no more, so it is very difficult for her mother and brother to arrange such a huge amount of ₹2 lakh as per their demand, the accused had given merciless beatings to her and turned the complainant out of the house in three wearing clothes on 05.01.2011. A Panchayat was convened by the complainant and her relatives and in the Panchayat, the accused persons apologized for misbehaving, taunting, torture, teasing and beating the complainant and further assured that they will not do so and upon their assurance, complainant joining the matrimonial home on 15.05.2011 at Tanda with the hopes that the accused persons will mend their attitude and behavior towards complainant, but the accused persons against started pressurizing the complainant to bring ₹2 lakh from her brother for carrying on the business of accused and when the complainant has shown her inability to fulfill their illegal demand of money, the accused persons confined the complainant in dark room without food, water and milk for her child. On 11.09.2011, the accused persons in connivance with each other turned the complainant out

of the matrimonial home and kept her child with them.

4. It is further averred that on 17.09.2011, the accused persons called upon by the complainant and her mother and relatives in Panchayat at Ambala city and accused persons were adamant on their illegal demand of ₹2 lakh and told that the complainants and her family must fulfill their demand otherwise complainant will not be allowed to enter into matrimonial home. The complainant demanded her entire dowry articles/Istridhan from accused persons which were entrusted to them for exclusive use of the complainant, but the accused persons flatly refused to return the same in the Panchayat at Ambala City. The dowry articles/Istridhan are being misused and misappropriated by the accused persons and refused to return the same to the complainant even after repeated requests and demands made by the complainant. The complainant was given mental harassment and torture for not bringing the adequate dowry as per the expectation of the accused persons. The matter was reported to the police of P.S. Ambala City on dated 19.09.2011, but police has not taken any action against the accused person; rather police had advised the complainant to seek her remedy in the offence U/s 498A, 406, 323 & 120-B IPC within the area of Police Station Ambala City. Legal action be taken against the accused persons.

5. On the basis of the aforesaid complaint of complainant, present FIR was registered against aforesaid accused person. Thereafter, investigation was commenced by ASI Vishavjeet Singh. During investigation, spot was inspected; Site Plan was prepared; statements of

witnesses under Section 161 Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (*hereinafter to be referred in short as “Cr.P.C.”*) were recorded; Site plan was prepared; during investigation, on finding incriminating evidence against accused, the accused persons were arrested in accordance with law and their Disclosure Statements were recorded. Upon completion of usual formalities of investigation, Final Police Report/Challan was prepared against accused persons forwarded in the Court for commencement of trial against them.

6. Thereafter, Copy of Final Police Report/Challan under Section 173 Cr.P.C. and accompanied documents was supplied to accused persons, free of cost, as contemplated under Section 207 of Cr.P.C. On careful scrutiny of Final Police Report/Challan, a prima-facie case for commission of offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 406, 323 & 120-B of IPC was made out against accused and accordingly, they were charge-sheeted thereunder on 19.10.2012, to which, they pleaded not guilty and claimed trial.

7. Prosecution in order to prove its case against accused persons has produced the following oral as well as documentary evidence on record:

Sr. No.	No. of witnesses	Description of witnesses	Description of Exhibits
1.	PW1 Sunheri Devi,	Mother of complainant	-----
2.	PW2 Sapna Bhatia,	Complainant	Ex.PW2/A- Complaint Mark-A-List of Dowry

			Articles/Istridhan Mark-B to Z- Photographs Mark-1 to 13- Photographs
3.	PW3 Deepak Bindlan	Witness	-----
4.	PW4 ASI Vishavjeet Singh,	Investigating Officer	Ex.PW4/A-FIR Ex.PW4/B-Endorsement
5.	PW5 Ct. Pardeep Kumar	Witness	-----

8. Statements of accused persons under Section 313 Cr.P.C were recorded, wherein all the incriminating material appearing against the accused in the evidence of the prosecution was put to accused and their explanation was sought. They refuted all the allegations leveled against them and stated that witnesses of the prosecution have deposed falsely and that they are innocent. They opted to adduce evidence in defence.

9. It is pertinent to mention here that during the stage of defence evidence, accused Raman Bhatia was declared proclaimed person vide order dated 27.01.2016 as he failed to appear in the court. Subsequently, on 04.09.2017 accused persons namely Shallu, Sudesh and Ranjan were also declared as proclaimed persons. Accused Raman Bhatia was re-arrested on 19.08.2025 and he was acquitted on 16.10.2025. The main file has been restored again when accused Ranjan Mehta was produced in the court.

10. In defence evidence, learned counsel for accused has **not** produced any evidence and on 04.08.2026, learned counsel vide his recorded statement of even date, closed his defence evidence.

11. This Court has carefully heard the arguments advanced by learned APP for the State and learned defence counsel and has also gone through the material brought on record in its entirety.

12. Learned APP for the State has argued that the marriage of the complainant took place with accused Raman Bhatia as per Hindu rites and rituals and the parents of the complainant spent sufficient amount beyond their capacity, but just after the marriage, accused persons started harassing the complainant for bringing more dowry and when complainant showed her inability to fulfill their demand, she was beaten mercilessly. The accused persons constantly pressurized the complainant to bring ₹2 Lakh for starting business and harassed and humiliated her for not bringing the aforesaid amount. The complainant tried to keep harmony with the family and to adjust herself in the family but the accused persons compelled her to leave the matrimonial house. The complainant and her family members also conveyed Panchayats for settlement and at one time, the accused persons admitted their mistake and assured to keep the complainant happy but they again started humiliating her and again threw her out from the matrimonial house and since then she is residing with her mother. The accused also misappropriated the dowry articles given to him and denied to return the dowry articles. Learned APP has further argued that the prosecution has

proved the case beyond reasonable doubt as the complainant and her mother have categorically stated that the accused persons harassed the complainant for demand of dowry and she was thrown out of her matrimonial house and her newly born baby was also kept by them and she was deprived of love and affection of the baby. Learned APP has further argued that the present accused was the main person who used to instigate Raman Bhatia to torture the complainant on the pretext of dowry demand and under his influence, Raman Bhatia used to harass and humiliate the complainant. With these averments, a prayer has been made that accused may be held guilty and convicted.

13. On the other hand, learned counsel on behalf of accused has argued that the prosecution has failed to assign any specific role against the present accused. No specific date or time has been mentioned when the present accused ever harassed and humiliated the complainant. The complainant has not assigned any specific role against the present accused. Learned counsel has further argued at the time of arguments learned APP has argued that the accused instigated Raman Bhatia to torture complainant but there is no evidence in this regard and mere oral averments in this regard are not sufficient to prove the allegations. The husband of the complainant has already been acquitted as the prosecution failed to prove the alleged allegations. Learned counsel has further argued that the prosecution has failed to prove that any dowry articles were handed over to the accused or any amount was handed over to the accused. With these averments, a prayer for acquittal of the accused has

been made.

14. After having heard learned APP for the State and learned defence counsel at length and after having gone through the case file very minutely, this Court has arrived at the conclusion that the prosecution has failed in proving the guilt of the accused beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt and this court is fully satisfied that the accused facing trial is entitled to get the benefit of doubt. In this context, first of all, this Court finds it appropriate to maintain that in order to prove the guilt of the accused, the prosecution has examined complainant Sapna as PW-2 who has deposed that her marriage was solemnized with Raman Bhatia on 27.10.2009 and all the accused persons were present in the marriage. An amount of ₹7 Lakh were spent on the marriage. After 15-20 days of the marriage, the accused persons starting taunting for bike and demanded an amount of ₹2 lakh for opening shop for Raman Bhatia. She has further deposed that on 11.09.2010, the accused persons gave beatings to her and threw her out from the house. Hence, in the examination-in-chief no specific role has been assigned to the present accused. In her cross-examination, she has admitted that the marriage of her sister-in-law Shallu Mehta and Ranjan Mehta took place earlier to her marriage. She has admitted that Ranjan was a resident of Jharkhand. She has self stated that he used to reside with her husband. She has further admitted that she did not give any Ration Card of Ranjan Mehta and Shallu Mehta to the police. She has admitted that no medical was got done by her regarding the beatings. She has admitted that she did not file any complaint for

snatching his baby.

15. The prosecution has also examined the mother of the complainant to substantiate the allegations of the complainant. She has appeared as PW1 and in her examination-in-chief, she has deposed that just after the marriage of her daughter, the accused persons started harassing her and demanded an amount of ₹2 lakh for starting business. She has further deposed that all the accused persons including Shallu, Raman Bhatia and Ranjan Mehta in connivance with each other used to harass and humiliate to her daughter. In her cross-examination, she has deposed that she does not know that the sister-in-law and her husband of her daughter are residents of Jharkhand. She has admitted that both were married earlier to marriage of her daughter. The another witness which was examined by the prosecution is PW3 Deepak Bindlan who has deposed that the in-laws of the complainant used to harass her for demand of dowry. A Panchayat was convened in this regard but the matter was not compromised. In his cross-examination, he has admitted that he did not know the names of the accused persons and he did not know the accused persons personally. He has admitted that the quarrel of the complainant was a husband-wife quarrel. He has deposed that the brother of the complainant told him about harassment of the complainant.

16. Hence, from the perusal of the testimony of the prosecution witnesses, it is clear that no specific allegations have been alleged by the complainant against the present accused. No specific date, time, month and year has been mentioned by the complainant when beatings were

given to her by the accused and his family members. No specific date and time has been mentioned when an amount of ₹2 lakh was demanded the accused from the complainant. The mother of the complainant is also not aware when the complainant was beaten and when the amount of ₹2 lakh was demanded by the accused and his family members. The complainant has alleged allegations against all the accused persons without specifically mentioning the role of the accused persons. She has no where averred that at any point of time accused Ranjan Mehta taunting her, harassed her, tortured her, demanded dowry from her or gave any beatings to her. All the allegations are general allegations and are oral allegations which are not supported by any documentary evidence. The complainant or her mother has no where averred that accused Ranjan Mehta ever demanded dowry from the complainant or ever demanded amount of ₹2 lakh of opening shop from Raman Bhatia. The complainant and her mother has also no where averred that any dowry articles were handed over to the present accused and he misappropriated the same.

17. It is the allegations against the present accused that he instigated the husband of the complainant to harass and humiliate the complainant but there is no evidence in this regard. The complainant has duly admitted in her cross-examination that the marriage of present accused was solemnized earlier to her marriage and she has also admitted that the accused is a resident of Jharkhand and no evidence has been adduced to prove that the present accused used to reside in the house of Raman Bhatia. Without any documentary evidence, it cannot be presumed

that the present accused had been residing with Raman Bhatia and he used to instigate Raman Bhatia to harass and humiliate the complainant. During the pendency of the present case, the complainant alleged that the present accused was the person who snatched her child from her but admittedly no such complaint or any other document has been placed on file by the prosecution to prove that the present accused snatched the child of the complainant from her custody.

18. In *Dara Lakshmi Narayana Vs State of Bihar, (2025) 3 SCC 735*, Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that “*A mere reference to the names of family members in a criminal case arising out of matrimonial dispute, without specific allegations indicating their active involvement should be nipped in the bud. It is a well recognized fact, borne out of judicial experience, that there is often a tendency to implicate all the members of the husband's family when domestic disputes arise out of a matrimonial discord. Such generalised and sweeping accusations unsupported by concrete evidence or particularised allegations cannot form the basis for criminal prosecution. Courts must exercise caution in such cases to prevent misuse of legal provisions and the legal process and avoid unnecessary harassment of innocent family members. We say so for as the reason that while the complainant/respondent no.2 has made vague and omnibus allegations against the accused/appellant herein, she has failed to justify the same before this Court. Such actions would create significant divisions and distrust among people, while also placing an unnecessary strain on the*

judicial system, particularly criminal courts”.

19. Recently, In Shobhit Kumar Mittal Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another SLP (Criminal No.4069 of 2024) decided on 24 September 2025, Hon’ble Supreme Court while referring Dara Lakshmi Narayana (Supra) case has held that “*merely stating that the accused/appellant has mentally harassed the complainant/respondent no.2 with respect to a demand for dowry does not fulfill the ingredients of Section 498A of IPC specially in absence of any cogent material or evidence on record to substantiate the said allegations. The term “cruelty” cannot be established without specific instances. The tendency of invoking the aforesaid provisions, without mentioning any specific detail, weakens the case of the prosecution and casts serious aspersions on the probability of the version of the complainant. Therefore, this court cannot ignore the missing specifics in the FIR which is the basic premise for invoking the criminal machinery of the State. In such cases involving allegations of cruelty and harassment, there would normally be a series of offending acts, which would be required to be spelt out by the complainant against perpetrators in specific terms to initiate criminal proceedings against them. Therefore, mere general allegations of harassment without pointing out the specific details would not be sufficient to continue criminal proceedings against any person. Courts have to be careful and cautions in dealing with complaints and must take pragmatic realities into consideration while dealing with matrimonial disputes where the allegations have to be scrutinized with great care and*

circumspection in order to prevent miscarriage of justice and abuse of process of law”.

20. Resultantly, due to absence of any incriminating evidence on record against the accused, the accused above named deserve benefit of doubt and extending the same, hence, **the accused Ranjan Mehta is hereby acquitted of the charges framed against him in this case. He be released from custody, if not required in any other case.**

21. A red ink note be given on the file that the same shall not be destroyed and be put up as and when the accused Shallu & Sudesh are produced by investigating agency or further proceedings are initiated by complainant. File be consigned to the Record Room after due compliance.

Pronounced in open Court:

12th August, 2026

(Manjeet Pal),
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Ambala, UID No.HR0402,

Note: Certified that this Judgment contains fourteen (14) pages and all pages have been duly checked and signed by me.

(Manjeet Pal),
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Ambala, UID No.HR0402,
12.08.2026

Manjeet Pal, (HR0402),
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Ambala, 12.08.2026

