

\$~94

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3482/2018 & Crl.M.A. 12635/2018

POOJA MEHTA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajat Aneja & Ms. Chandrika
Gupta, Advs.

versus

THE STATE & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ravi Nayak, APP for the State
W/SI Jaspreet , PS Rajinder Nagar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K.GAUBA

ORDER

%

16.07.2018

The petitioner is the author of the complaint leading to the registration of FIR No. 175/2017 statedly involving offences punishable under Sections 498A/354/406/34 IPC by police station Rajiinder Nagar. It is stated, the complaint leading to the registration of the said FIR was lodged in October, 2016. The petitioner was married to the son of the second respondent on 15.10.2010. It is stated at the bar by the counsel for the petitioner that the allegations attributing acts of commission and omission to the second respondent constituting offence under Section 354 IPC occurred in 2012 in U.K. where the petitioner with her husband were living at the relevant point of time. No complaint by the petitioner qua the conduct of the second respondent constituting such offence was lodged with any authority till 2016.

In these circumstances, the view taken by the learned Sessions Judge in granting bail to the second respondent by order dated 21.04.2018 to which exception is taken by the petition at hand cannot be said to be perverse, erroneous or illegal.

The petition seeking withdrawal of the bail order, therefore, is dismissed. This rendered the application for exemption infructuous, it being disposed of accordingly.

R.K.GAUBA, J

JULY 16, 2018

nk