

\$~32

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 2739/2016**

MS RAGINI LAL

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Hemendra, Advocate.

versus

STATE, NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ashok Kumar Garg, APP for
State along with W/SI Anita, PS Paschim Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

02.08.2016

%

CRL.M.A. 11720/2016

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

The application is disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 2739/2016 & CRL.M.A.11719/2016

Aggrieved by the order dated 14th May, 2016, granting permission to respondent No.2 to travel abroad, the petitioner filed a Revision Petition, which was dismissed vide the impugned order dated 6th June, 2016. Hence the present petition.

Respondent No.2 is the husband of the petitioner and accused in case FIR No. 252/2013 under Section 498A/406/34 IPC, registered at Police Station Paschim Vihar. The petitioner was granted permission by the

learned trial court to go abroad, as the same was required for his terms of services. However, while granting the permissions, the learned trial court imposed the following conditions:-

- “1. No adjournment shall be sought on the ground of absence of the applicant/accused.
2. Accused/applicant shall appear before this Court as and when he is directed for the purpose of trial of this Court before 05.01.2017.
3. The applicant/accused shall furnish the personal bond in the sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- along with one surety in the like amount.
4. The applicant/accused shall furnish his contact details to the Court.”

Before this court, learned counsel admits that respondent No.2 had earlier visited abroad and had returned back. However, his contention is that when earlier he was granted permission to go abroad, he deposited the documents relating to his property at Mohali, Chandigarh, in lieu of furnishing the personal bond in the sum of Rs.2,00,000/-, which document was returned to him. Even now, as per the order dated 14th May, 2016, the petitioner is required to furnish a personal bond in the sum of Rs.2,00,000/-, however, this court cannot insist that in lieu of furnishing the said bond, the respondent No.2 should deposit title deeds of the same property.

The prayer of the petitioner is misconceived. The petition is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

AUGUST 02, 2016 /‘n’