

**\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of Reserve: October 27, 2010

Date of Order: 2<sup>nd</sup> November, 2010

**+ Bail Application No. 1451/2010**

%

**02.11.2010**

**Meena**

**... Petitioner**

Through: Mr. Amit Sahni, Advocate &  
Mr. Sanjeet Singh Arya, Advocate

Versus

**State**

**... Respondent**

Through: Mr. Sunil Sharma, APP for the State  
With Mr. Ved Prakash, Si

**JUSTICE SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA**

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not?
3. Whether judgment should be reported in Digest?

**ORDER**

This application under Section 438 Cr.P.C. has been made for anticipatory bail on behalf of the sister-in-law (*jethani*) of the deceased, who committed suicide within four months of the marriage. Perusal of final report/charge-sheet filed against the accused persons would show that the allegations made by father of the deceased are that after two months of marriage, husband of deceased started beating her and she used to call her mother to tell about the beatings given by her husband. Deceased visited her parents' house as she was pregnant in May, 2010. It is alleged that at the time deceased who was pregnant went to her parents' house, father-in-law Suresh Kumar told her when she gives birth to a male child, her parents would have to give a car. Deceased came back to her matrimonial home after

her stay of 10-12 days at her parents' house. After she moved to her matrimonial home, she allegedly committed suicide. Her father made a statement to the police that during her stay Geeta (deceased) had told him that her *jeth* and *jethani* used to quarrel with her and her husband and stated that they would not let her settle. There are no other allegation against *jeth* and *jethani* except the allegation that they used to quarrel with her (deceased) and her husband. It is obvious from the statement that this quarrel was not for dowry demand. The reason for quarrel is not given but in any case even if this statement is believed true, it cannot be considered that the applicant was prima facie involved in offence under Section 304B IPC.

2. I, therefore, consider that it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. The application is allowed. It is directed that in case of arrest of applicant, the applicant shall be released on bail on her executing personal bond of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the IO/SHO concerned. The applicant, however, shall join investigation as and when called, by serving a notice under Section 160 Cr.P.C.

**November 02, 2010**

vn

**SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA, J.**