

\$~11

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 29.08.2018

BAIL APPLN. 1058/2018

SMT. KRISHNA BHOJ & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Amit Kumar Singh and Mr. Amith J., Advs.

For the Respondent : Mr. Neelam Sharma, Addl. PP for the State with
W/SI Davinder Kaur
Mr. B.N. Singhvi, Adv. for complainant

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

%

29.08.2018

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners seek anticipatory Bail in case FIR No. 307 of 2016 under Sections 498-A/406 of the IPC Police Station Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi.

2. Petitioner no. 1 is the mother-in-law of complainant and petitioner no. 2 is brother-in-law of complainant.

3. The allegations in the FIR are that the husband of the prosecutrix after marriage did not treat her well and thereafter has abandoned her. The allegations against the petitioners are that they are not disclosing the

whereabouts of the husband who was lastly contacted by the complainant from Singapore and the petitioners are shielding him. It is further submitted that the jewellery articles of the complainant are with the mother in law of petitioner no. 1.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complainant and her husband (i.e. son of the petitioner No. 1) had not resided with them but last resided in Singapore and there are no jewellery articles in possession of the petitioners. It is submitted that petitioner No. 2 is a resident of Malaysia.

5. Learned counsel further submits that there are no allegations against the petitioners in the subject FIR to warrant registration of a case against them. He further submits that the petitioners are not aware of the whereabouts of the husband of the complainant and have made all the efforts abroad to trace out his whereabouts.

6. By order dated 28.05.2018, interim protection was granted to the petitioners, subject to petitioners joining investigation. Learned Addl. PP informs that petitioner No. 1 did join investigation and as Petitioner No. 2 is resident abroad, no notice was issued to him to join investigation.

7. On perusal of the record and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the petitioners have made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. Accordingly, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the arresting officer/IO/SHO shall release the petitioners on bail on their furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- each with one surety each of the like

amount to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Investigating Officer/SHO concerned. The petitioners shall not do anything that may prejudice either the trial or the prosecution witnesses. Petitioners shall also join investigation as and when required by the IO.

9. The Petition is disposed of in the above terms.

10. Order *Dasti* under signatures of the Court Master

AUGUST 29, 2018
‘rs’

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

