

\$~5

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2272/2019**

RAMESH CHAND JAIN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Mohit Mathur, Sr. Advocate with
Mr Sahil Munjal, Ms Rhea Gandhi,
Mr Prateek Goswami and Mr Kaushal
Kaushik, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Ms Kusum Dhalla, APP for State.
Mr Rajiv Khosla, Ms Roshini Singh,
Mr Ashok Kumar Dhull and Mr Sunil
Singh, Advocates for complainant.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

24.10.2019

CRL.M.A. 35643/2019

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

BAIL APPLN. 2272/2019

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that anticipatory bail be granted to him in relation to FIR No.0272/2019 under Sections 498A/304B/34 of the IPC registered with PS Keshav Puram, Delhi.

3. The status report has been filed, which indicates that the crime team had arrived at the site on 11.08.2019 on receipt of information that the body of the deceased was hanging from a fan. It is stated that although the husband of the deceased was present on the spot, other family members had

run away.

4. The deceased was married to the petitioner's son on 13.12.2018 (which is barely eight months prior to the aforesaid incident). The father of the deceased had alleged that the deceased was being harassed and was kept in a room without food, from time to time. The deceased was four months pregnant at the material time. It is alleged that she was being harassed mentally by her husband as well as by her in laws (father-in-law, mother-in-law, brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law). It is also alleged that they had demanded dowry articles like AC, laptop, LED TV, etc.

5. The status report indicates that all family members of the deceased's husband are being held responsible for the incident. The husband of the deceased has been arrested.

6. The petitioner has not been arrested as yet. This Court is informed that a chargesheet has not been filed. However, it is stated that the chargesheet against the son of the petitioner (husband of the deceased) has been filed.

7. Undeniably, the charges in this case are serious. It is stated that the household was a shared household. The petitioner is the senior most member of the family and his role would be vital in such circumstances. In view of the above, this Court does not consider it apposite to accede to the prayer in the present case.

8. Ms Dhalla, learned APP appearing for the State, states that insofar as the investigation in relation to the other two sons of the petitioner is concerned (other than the husband of the deceased), the investigation is complete. She also states that they had joined the investigation and

currently the police authorities do not intend to arrest them. She also clarifies that the said persons have already secured protective orders and, in the event, they are required to be arrested, necessary steps would be taken in that regard.

9. Thus, the petitioner's wife does have family members to attend to her and it is not necessary that anticipatory bail be granted to the petitioner for this purpose.

10. In view of the above, the petition is dismissed.

11. Order *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

OCTOBER 24, 2019
MK