

\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1887/2015**

PREET PAL SINGH

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr. C. Parkash with Mr. Sachin
Kumar, Advs.**

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Represented by: **Mr. Hirein Sharma, APP with
SI Raj Pal, PS Tilak Nagar.
Ms. Neetu Singh, Adv. for
complainant with complainant.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

19.08.2016

%

1. By the present petition, the petitioner who is the husband of the complainant seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 1524/2014 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at PS Tilak Nagar.
2. The allegations against the petitioner are of demand of car after about 2 months of marriage. Since, according to the complainant, her father was suffering from liver problem and her brother was unemployed, they were not able to fulfil the demand. As a result of non-fulfilment of demand, the petitioner took away mobile phone of the complainant and she was not permitted to speak to her parents. When her parents came to matrimonial home, they were insulted. During the course of pregnancy, the complainant was confined in a room and was not provided medicine and food. Since a girl child was born to the unliking of the petitioner and his family members,

the complainant was sent to her parental home on 3rd May, 2014 and since then she has been residing over there.

3. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the marriage between the parties was a simple marriage wherein there was no transaction of dowry and that they were living happily in the matrimonial home and blessed with a female child on 24th July, 2013.

4. Indubitably, proceedings under Sections 498A/406 IPC are not meant to be recovery proceedings however the claim of the petitioner that marriage was a simple marriage with no dowry transacted is falsified from the photographs of the marriage which show that some amount of cash was transacted. Even the certificates of the education of the complainant are being retained by the petitioner. As per the allegations, the complainant was made to leave the matrimonial home in a pre-planned manner.

5. Considering the facts of the case, I do not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Petition is dismissed.

7. Order dasti

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

AUGUST 19, 2016
‘V MITTAL’