

\$~11

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

% Judgment delivered on: 02.05.2019

+ BAIL APPLN. 2497/2018

AMARJEET

..... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajeev Lochan with Mr. Hemant
Sharma and Mr. Sarvesh Kumar,
Advocates.

For the Respondent: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for the
State with the SI Prem Yadav, PS Ranhola.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.180/2016 under Sections 304B/498A/34 IPC, Police Station Ranhola.
2. Petitioner is the brother-in-law of the deceased. The deceased committed suicide after three years of marriage. Petitioner was residing with the deceased and her husband in the same house.
3. FIR was registered consequent to the complaint lodged by the mother of the deceased that the deceased was being harassed and the

demands for dowry were being made by her-in-laws including the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. He submits that there was no demand for dowry and the allegations are vague. He submits that on the contrary, regularly money was being transferred by the husband of the deceased to the mother of the deceased for her subsistence so there is no question of any demand for dowry. He submits that money was transferred regularly starting from January 2014 and continued till the very last.

5. Learned APP for the State, under instructions from the Investigating Office, submits that the details of the bank accounts of the mother of the deceased have been obtained, which shows that the money was being deposited in the account of the mother of the deceased off and on from January, 2014. She submits that the money was routed through a local agent whose statement has been recorded and who has confirmed that the money was transferred at the instance of the husband of the deceased.

6. Petitioner has been in custody since 27.02.2016.

7. 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.

8. Accordingly, on petitioner furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs.20,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court, the 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.

9. Petition is allowed in the above terms.

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

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MAY 02, 2019
st