

\$~2

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

% Judgment delivered on: 29.05.2019

+ BAIL APPLN. 1340/2019

YASHPAL @ PANKAJ

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE (GOVT. NCT OF DELHI)

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Dharam Raj Ohlan and Mr. Pradeep Dahiya,
Advs.

For the Respondent: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, Addl. PP for the State with
Insp. Raj Kumar, SI Balram, P.S.J.P.Kalan.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.215/2018 under Sections 498-A/304-B/34 IPC, Police Station Jaffarpur Kalan.
2. Petitioner is the husband of the deceased. The petitioner has been in custody since 30.12.2018. Deceased was married to the petitioner on 23.11.2017.
3. FIR was registered consequent to the complaint lodged by the father of the deceased. He contended that he had spent approximately

Rs. 25 lakhs on the marriage of his daughter, given 20 *tolas* of gold articles and one Alto Car in the marriage of his daughter. It is alleged that after marriage, the petitioner, his mother and sister i.e. sister-in-law of the deceased started making demands for dowry and asking her to bring a bigger car.

4. It is alleged that on 25.02.2018 Rs. One lakh was given to the petitioner and thereafter in April, 2018 another sum of Rs. 70,000/- was given. There was further demand for dowry which was not met. Subsequently, it is alleged that on 29.12.2018 the deceased committed suicide.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He submits that apart from bald allegations there is no material to show any demand for dowry was made or there was any harassment on the part of the petitioner or any family members.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the deceased committed suicide on account of some medical condition. He further submits that investigation is complete, chargesheet has been filed and the chargesheet specifically records that a notice under Section 91 Cr. P.C. was given to the complainant to establish the payment of the alleged sum of Rs. 1,70,000/- and the expenditure of Rs. 25 lakhs incurred by him on the marriage of the his daughter. However, the details of above expenditure were not provided to the Investigating

Officer.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedents.

8. Petitioner has been in custody since 30.12.2018.

9. Without commenting on the merits of the case and keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that the trial is likely to take some time, I am satisfied that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of regular bail.

10. Accordingly, on petitioner furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, petitioner shall be released on bail, if not required in any other case. Petitioner shall not do anything which may prejudice either the trial or the prosecution witnesses.

11. Petition is allowed in the above terms.

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

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 29, 2019

rk