

\$~14

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2258/2016**

YASMIN

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. U.A. Khan with Mr.
Shahrukh Khan, Advs.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ravi Nayak, APP with SI
Vishvendra, Ps Seemapuri.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

25.01.2017

%

1. By the present petition, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.922/2016 under Sections 498A/304B/34 IPC registered at PS Seema Puri pursuant to death of Anjum on the complaint of her father.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no allegation against the petitioner who is an old lady aged 50 years. There are improvements in the supplementary statement of Hasruddin recorded after a period of 8 days. All other accused with similar role have been granted anticipatory bail and husband of the deceased has also been granted regular bail.
3. The above noted FIR was registered on the statement of Hasruddin recorded before the SDM wherein he stated that he had married his daughter Anjum on 11th October, 2014 with Javed Hussain. However, after the marriage, she was harassed for demand dowry though he had spent ₹4 lakhs in the marriage which was beyond his capacity and he had even taken a loan

for the marriage. Since his daughter was continuously harassed for demand of dowry, around 10 months ago, he had paid ₹10,000/- and three-four months ago ₹5000/-. The husband and mother in law of his daughter used to beat her. However, he made no complaint because he wanted to see his daughter settled. He last spoke to his daughter 5-6 days prior to the incident when she was happy however she apprised him that her mother-in-law and husband troubled her. In the supplementary statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. on 17th October, 2010, Hasruddin reiterated his earlier statement and also stated that he had given a Honda Shine motorcycle in the marriage. However, after 1-1½ years, his son-in-law demanded new Bullet motorcycle. As he could not give another bullet motorcycle, the father-in-law and mother-in-law of the deceased pressurized him to give the same. The deceased died due to consumption of hydrochloride acid.

4. Considering the fact that there are specific allegations against the petitioner, who is the mother-in-law of the deceased, this Court finds no case for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Petition is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

JANUARY 25, 2017

‘v mittal’