

\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 421/2016**

AMJAD ALI Petitioner

Through: Mr. Harish Kumar, Adv.

versus

STATE Respondent

Through: Ms. Kusum Dhalla, APP for State
with ASI S.K. Shrivastava, P.S.
Chandni Mahal.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

02.08.2016

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is husband of complainant. In the FIR, complainant has made general allegations without giving specific instances of demand of dowry. Petitioner has been falsely implicated. Petitioner's sister, brother and brother's wife besides other have also been implicated in the FIR by levelling general allegations.

Learned APP for the State submits that complainant has stated in the FIR that marriage was solemnized on 15th April, 2014 and ₹5 lacs was spent. At the time of marriage, petitioner had represented that he was having a flat in his name and was earning ₹50,000/-. After the marriage, it was revealed that petitioner was not owning any flat, inasmuch as, was not earning the amount as represented at the time of marriage. Complainant has alleged that petitioner demanded ₹2 lacs, car and laptop and turned the complainant

out of the house in the night of 23rd December, 2014.

Petitioner has joined the investigation. This fact has not been disputed. Keeping in mind totality of circumstances, 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 ₹25,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer/SHO concerned. However, petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer and join the investigation as and when called upon to do so.

Bail application is disposed of in the above terms.

Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

AUGUST 02, 2016

ga