

\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 1171/2018 & CRL.M.A. 9722/2018**
PAWAN KUMAR Petitioner
Through Mr. Milind Gauram, Adv.
versus

STATE Respondent
Through Mr. Raghuvinder Varma, APP for
State with SI Vidyakar Pathak, PS
Anand Parbat.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER
% **28.05.2018**

Status report has been submitted by the State, which indicates that the applicant has joined the investigation and also indicates that the investigation is almost completed and the charge-sheet would soon be filed.

On behalf of the applicant, it has been submitted that the articles of the dowry of the complainant have been returned. As per the document placed on record qua returning dowry articles which includes also the articles of jewellery of the complainant.

Placed on record is also a settlement document dated 30.03.2017 in relation to a settlement arrived at between the petitioner and his spouse, the complainant whereby the parties had agreed to live together and the complainant had agreed to withdraw the complaint. In relation thereto it is indicated as per record and submitted on behalf of the petitioner that Crl. M.C. 4898/2017 has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking quashing
BAIL APPLN. 1171/2018

of the FIR No. 246/16, PS Anand Parbat, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 submitting to the effect that there were no grievances left between the parties in relation to which, notice of the petition has been issued to the complainant.

In view of the submissions that have been made on behalf of the petitioner in Crl. M.C. 4898/2017 that she was not co-operating and a verification report has been called in relation to the aspect whether the wife i.e. the petitioner no. 1 and the respondent no. 2 were living together qua which a verification report was submitted under signatures of the SHO PS Anand Parbat to the effect that petitioner no. 1 of the Crl. M.C. 4898/2017 i.e. the applicant of the present BAIL APPLN. 1171/2018 and the complainant are not living together. The complainant was also present in the Court during the course of the proceedings under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 stating that she was not living with her spouse and that she opposes the prayer made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is still willing to live with the complainant.

Taking the totality of the circumstances of the case, the applicant is allowed to be released on bail in the event of arrest subject to the appellant furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court and subject to the condition that he shall not leave the country without the permission of

the learned Trial Court and shall not intimidate the witnesses in any manner.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

MAY 28, 2018/MK