

ITEM NO.104

COURT NO.8

SECTION II

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(s). 1168 OF 2003

JAGGU SINGH

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF U.P. & ANR.

Respondent(s)

Date: 08/04/2010

This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARJIT SINGH BEDI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.M. PANCHAL

For Appellant(s)

Mr. Abhindra Maheshwari, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Sengar, Adv.
Mr. Pankaj Singh, Adv.
Mr. Vishwajit Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Prashant Chaudhary, Adv.
Mr. Mukul Singh, Adv.
Mr. Praveen Swarup, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The appeal is dismissed in terms of the
signed order.

(KALYANI GUPTA)
SR. P.A.

(VINOD KULVI)
COURT MASTER

[SIGNED ORDER IS PLACED ON THE FILE.]

Cr1. App. No. 1168 of 2003

2

Cr1. App. No. 1168 of 2003

3

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 1168 OF 2003

VERSUS

STATE OF U.P. & ANR.

.....

RESPON

DENTS

O R D E R

1. This appeal is against the concurrent finding of the trial court as well as the High Court whereby respondent No. 2, the husband has been acquitted for the offences under Sections 304B and 498A of the Indian Penal Code for having caused the dowry death of his wife about two years after the marriage.

Both the courts have noted that a suicide note had been written by the deceased shortly before her death in which she had observed that nobody was responsible for her death either from the side of her in-laws or from the side of her parents and she was committing suicide as she had lost interest in life and that nobody should be held responsible for her death.

The courts below have also noted that the attempt of

the appellant herein Jaggu Singh, the father of the deceased, Crl. App. No. 1168 of 2003

to bring in evidence in Court with regard to the cruelty meted out to his late daughter could not be believed for the simple reason that he had made no such statement under Section 161 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

We are, therefore, of the opinion that in the light of the concurrent findings of fact recorded by the trial court as well as by the High Court, no interference is called for in this appeal.

2. For the reasons aforesaid, the appeal is dismissed.

.....J
[HARJIT SINGH BEDI]

.....J
[J.M. PANCHAL]

NEW DELHI
APRIL 08, 2010.