

\$~60

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 74/2018**

KRISHNA DEVI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sachin Sharma, Adv.

versus

GNCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Addl. PP for the
State with Inspr. Rajender

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

11.01.2018

Crl. M.A. 568/2018 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 74/2018

1. The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 601/2017 under Sections 304B/498A/34 IPC registered at Police Station Shahbad Dairy, Delhi.

2. The subject FIR has been registered on the complaint of Smt. Raj Kumari, mother of the deceased. It is contended that the deceased was married to the petitioner's son about two years prior to her death. It is alleged that the petitioner and her son used to mistreat the deceased and make demands of dowry from the complainant as well. The FIR also records that a day prior to the incident the deceased had called up the complainant and complained of a fight which happened

at her house. The FIR further contends that the complainant received a call from one of the neighbours that her daughter had attempted to commit suicide and had been shifted to BSA Hospital. On reaching BSA Hospital they found that their daughter had passed away. In these circumstances, the complaint has been registered contending that they suspect the petitioner and her son of having instigated her daughter to commit suicide.

3. Learned Addl. PP for the State submits that investigation is at a very initial stage and since there are specific allegations against the petitioner, custodial interrogation is necessary, in the facts of the present case. Learned Addl. PP further submits that the incident had happened within two years of the marriage and there are specific allegations of dowry demands being made not only to the deceased but also to the complainant.

4. I have perused the averments in the FIR which specifically make imputations against the petitioner. The investigation is also at preliminary stage and keeping in view the gravity of the offence, the request of the prosecution for custodial interrogation, in the facts of the present case, to my mind, does not seem to be unreasonable.

5. In view of the above, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

JANUARY 11, 2018

‘rs’