

\$~7

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1786/2016

MANJU DEVI

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr.A.P.Singh, Advocate with
Mr.V.P.Singh & Ms.Geeta Chauhan,
Advocates.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through : Mr.Amit Gupta, APP with SI Chander
Kanta, PS Dabri.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.P.GARG

ORDER

%

09.09.2016

1. Present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been preferred by the petitioner – Manju Devi, victim's mother for cancellation of bail granted to respondent No.2 by an order dated 27.09.2014.
2. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have examined the file.
3. Admitted position is that respondent No.2 is facing trial in case FIR No.702/2014 registered under Sections 376/323/450 IPC and Section 4 POCSO Act at PS Dabri. Charge-sheet has since been filed. It further reflects that by an order dated 15.09.2014 interim bail for two weeks was granted to respondent No.2 to arrange marriage ceremony with the prosecutrix. Subsequently, the marriage between the prosecutrix and respondent No.2 took place in the presence of their parents. On 27.09.2014, the interim bail granted to respondent No.2 was confirmed.

4. It further reveals that after marriage, both the respondent No.2 and the victim had lived together.
5. It is alleged that subsequently the respondent No.2 started harassing the prosecutrix on account of dowry demands.
6. Impugned order reveals that the statements of the prosecutrix and her mother have already been recorded before the Trial Court on 10.04.2015 and 01.08.2015 respectively. The victim has been permitted to take appropriate remedy with regard to her allegations regarding harassing on account of dowry demands. The Trial Court did not commit any irregularity in observing that harassment on account of dowry demands subsequent to the grant of bail was not a valid ground for cancellation of bail.
7. Learned counsel for the victim's mother urged that the marriage of a child victim with the respondent No.2 was contrary to the provisions of law. In my view, this aspect cannot be gone through in the present proceedings for cancellation of bail. Regular bail was granted to respondent No.2 in the presence of the child-victim and her mother without any objection from them.
8. The petition lacks merits and is dismissed.

S.P.GARG, J

SEPTEMBER 09, 2016 / tr