

\$~17

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(CRL) 1267/2019
ANIL SHARMA & ANR Petitioners
Through: Mr R. K. Rawat, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE & ORS Respondents
Through: Mr Rahul Mehra, Standing Counsel
with SI Jagdish, PS Bindapur.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

% **05.12.2019**

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

- “a) direct the police authorities, crime branch or any independent agencies to conduct again free and fair investigation of FIR No.1387/2015 u/s 306/34 IPC PS Bindapur Delhi;
- b) grant compensation of Rs. 10 lacs as per provision of section 250(1) CrPC in favour of the petitioners for their false implication.”

2. The petitioners’ minor daughter had died an unnatural death. It is indicated that she had committed suicide. It is the petitioners’ case that she was forced to do so on account of being harassed by two persons, Ravinder and Surrender. Ravinder and Surinder are brothers. FIR No.1387/2015, under Sections 306/34 of the IPC, was registered on the directions of the learned MM issued pursuant to an application filed by the petitioner under Section 156(3) of the CrPC.

3. The status report indicates that investigation was carried out and it

was found that Surender (alleged to be a friend the deceased) had left for his village on 05.03.2015. Thus, he was not in Delhi as on the date of incident – 13.04.2015. The status report also indicates that Ravinder had clearly stated that he had not made any call to the deceased. CDRs of the mobile phone were obtained and the same confirmed that Surender was in his native village since about one month, prior to the date of the incident. He had made no call on the date of incident to the deceased. It was found that Ravinder had not made any call to the deceased and there was no conversation between Ravinder and the deceased prior to the date of incident.

4. There is also no evidence to suggest that the deceased had committed suicide on being harassed by Surender. The deceased had left behind a suicide note, which indicates the reasons for her taking the drastic step. It is not necessary to examine or comment on merits of the said reasons; suffice it to state that she had not taken the drastic step on being harassed by any either Surender or his brother Ravinder.

5. The learned Sessions Court has after considering the matter, discharged the accused (the petitioners).

6. In view of the above, this Court finds no merit in the present petition. The same is dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

DECEMBER 05, 2019/ MK