

\$~8 to 10

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2198/2018 & CrI.M.B. 1497/2018**

POONAM SAYAL

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Rikki Gupta, Mr. Aman Singh
Brar, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP with SI
Sandeep Kumar PS Vasant Kunj (S)
Ms. Panitra Kaur, Adv. for
complainant.

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2199/2018 & CrI.M.B. 1498/2018**

DHRUV KAPOOR

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Rikki Gupta, Mr. Aman Singh
Brar, Advs.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP with SI
Sandeep Kumar PS Vasant Kunj (S)
Ms. Panitra Kaur, Adv. for
complainant.

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2259/2018 & CrI.M.B. 1539/2018**

MARIYAM

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Abhijit Mittal, Adv.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Represented by: Mr. Ashok Garg, APP with SI
Sandeep Kumar PS Vasant Kunj (S)
Ms. Panitra Kaur, Adv. for
complainant.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER
24.04.2019

%

1. By these petitions the petitioners seek anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 211/2018 under Sections 323/356/379/354B/506/34 IPC registered at PS Vasant Kunj South.
2. The allegations in the complaint by Ms. Meera Syal are that Ms. Poonam Sayal, her son Dhruv Kapoor and one domestic helper assaulted her and snatched her purse containing ₹3 lakhs and a mobile phone. They also unleashed the dog upon her lady attendant namely Karuna.
3. During the course of investigation medical examination of the complainant and Karuna was got conducted and their statements were recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C.
4. Since the parties were related, this Court referred the disputes between the parties to mediation.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner and complainant state that the parties have now settled the matter, terms of settlement have already been decided, however the parties have still to sign the terms of settlement.
6. In view of the fact that the parties have principally arrived at a settlement, this Court deems it fit to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. It is therefore directed that in the event of arrest the petitioners be released on bail on their furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹25,000/- each with

8

one surety bond each of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ SHO concerned. It is however clarified that in case the parties do not act on the settlement arrived at between them, they would be entitled to seek modification of the present order.

7. Petitions and applications are accordingly disposed of.
8. Order dasti.


MUKTA GUPTA, J.

APRIL 24, 2019
'ga'