

\$~3

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

% Judgment delivered on: 15.02.2019

+ BAIL APPLN. 2450/2018

BHUPENDER NARANG

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajesh Sherawat, Advocate.

For the Respondent: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for the State.
SI Shashi Kumar, PS Shalimar Bagh.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No.321/2018 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, Police Station Shalimar Bagh.
2. On 16.10.2018, learned counsel appearing for the complainant submits that despite the petitioner having admitted before the Trial Court that he was in possession of certain dowry articles, he has not returned any of the dowry articles.
3. On 16.10.2018, statement of counsel for the petitioner was recorded that he was willing to return all articles which was in his possession except jewellery which was stated to have already been taken away by the complainant, however, to show his *bonafide*, petitioner had agreed to deposit a sum of Rs.2 lakhs with the Trial Court in the form of a fixed

deposit. The petitioner was further directed to join investigation.

4. Learned APP for the State, under instructions, submits that the petitioner has deposited the said sum of Rs.2 lakhs with the Trial Court and also returned all the articles except for some which the complainant did not identify.

5. Learned APP for the State, under instructions, further submits that, as of now, there is no cause to arrest the petitioner.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case and on perusal of the record, I am satisfied that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the arresting officer/IO/SHO shall release the petitioner on bail on his furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Investigating Officer/SHO concerned. Petitioner shall not do anything which may prejudice either the investigation, trial or the prosecution witnesses.

7. Petition is allowed in the above terms.

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

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

FEBRUARY 15, 2019/st