

\$~10

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 1513/2014

AMIT TYAGI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Adv.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Yogesh Verma, APP for State  
with SI Rajesh Kumar, P.S.  
Vikaspuri.

Mr. Utsav Pandey, Adv. for  
complainant.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK**

**ORDER**

%

**07.05.2015**

Present FIR under Sections 498-A/406/34 IPC has been registered at police station Vikas Puri on the complaint of petitioner's wife. Complainant has alleged in the FIR that after the marriage she was ill treated by the petitioner and his family on the point of dowry. In the month of August, 2011 ₹7 lacs was demanded from her. Her parents paid ₹2 lacs to petitioner pursuant to said demand. However, petitioner and his family members continued to demand dowry even thereafter. She was maltreated, accordingly, FIR No. 197/13 under Sections 498-A/323/506 IPC and 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act was registered at police station Indirapuram, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh on her complaint. However, during the

investigations, matter was settled before the Mediation Centre, District Court, Ghaziabad wherein petitioner assured that he would not harass the complainant. Pursuant to the said settlement, complainant joined the company of petitioner but again she was not treated properly, inasmuch as ₹10 lacs was demanded from her. Complainant has alleged that she was not even provided proper food. On 29<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 she was thrown out from the matrimonial home at Ghaziabad and she started living with her parents at Delhi.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that allegations are not correct. No demand of dowry was made from her. Complainant was treated nicely during her stay in matrimonial home at Ghaziabad. She could not adjust in the family and left of her own free will. It is further submitted that whatever articles were with the petitioner the same have already been returned to the complainant. However, this fact has been disputed by the Additional Public Prosecutor (APP), who is assisted by the counsel for the complainant.

Learned APP submits that Alto car has not been returned. It is further submitted that jewellery articles have also not been returned. He further submits that certain articles which did not belong to the complainant were

offered, therefore, complainant declined to receive the same.

During the course of hearing, it is revealed that petitioner has already deposited ₹2.5 lacs in the trial court. Learned counsel for the petitioner has offered to deposit another ₹3 lacs with the Registrar General of this Court during the pendency of trial.

Keeping in mind totality of the circumstances, subject to petitioner depositing ₹3 lacs with the Registrar General of this Court within four weeks, it is ordered that in case of arrest petitioner be released on anticipatory bail subject to his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹20,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer/Station House Officer of the concerned police station as the case may be. The amount so deposited in the Registry shall be kept in FDR, initially for a period of one year with automatic renewals thereof.

Bail application is disposed of in the above terms.

Dasti.

**A.K. PATHAK, J.**

**MAY 07, 2015**  
ga