

\$~15

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

+ CRL.M.C. 4007/2015

SIMMI CHAUDHARY

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. S.P. Nangia, Advocate

versus

THE STATE ( NCT OF DELHI) & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashish Dutta, APP for the State.  
Mr. Sumit Tanwar, Advocate for R-2.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K.GAUBA**

**ORDER**

%

**03.08.2018**

The FIR No. 488/2015 of police station Fatehpur Beri has been lodged at the instance of the petitioner alleging offences punishable under Sections 354/506/509 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) in which accusations have been made against the second respondent, who is her father-in-law. On the application moved by the second respondent (bail application no. 3633/2015), the court of Sessions called for a report from the police and having heard all sides, by order dated 17.08.2015, directed the second respondent to be released on furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety in the like amount in the event of he being arrested subject to the condition that he would not intimidate or influence the complainant or other prosecution witnesses.

The petition at hand was filed on 10.09.2015 seeking cancellation of the aforesaid anticipatory bail order. The petition has remained pending for

almost three years now. On 22.07.2016, it was jointly submitted on behalf of the petitioner and second respondent that there was possibility of amicable settlement being reached between the parties. The said submission was reiterated on subsequent dates. On their request, the parties were referred to mediation by order dated 30.08.2017. The process of mediation is still underway.

While the parties are exploring the possibility of amicable resolution, it is not fair to keep this matter hanging fire as if it were a democle's sword hanging over the head of the second respondent. Even otherwise, on perusal, this Court finds no error or illegality in the impugned order. The parties, it is conceded, are locked in various cases – five in number even as per the submissions of the counsel for the petitioner. It is clear from the submissions made that there is a dispute over property.

Having regard to these facts and circumstances, the order releasing the second respondent on anticipatory bail cannot be faulted.

The petition is dismissed.

**R.K.GAUBA, J.**

**AUGUST 03, 2018**

nk