

\$~9

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3040/2019**

JASVINDER SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Rahul Rajan, Mr Devesh Kumar
Chauvia and Mr Satnam Singh,
Advocates.

versus

STATE OF N.C.T OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Ms Meenakshi Chauhan, APP for
State.
SI Govind Singh, PS Uttam Nagar.
Mr Tajinder Singh, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

08.01.2020

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, seeking bail in connection with FIR No. 929/2014 under Sections 498A/406/34/174A of the IPC, registered with PS Uttam Nagar, Delhi.
2. The said FIR was registered at the instance of the petitioner's wife. She and the petitioner were married on 30.10.2011 and she claimed that her parents had spent ₹13,00,000/- in her marriage ceremony. She had further alleged that she had been subjected to physical as well as mental abuse at the hands of the petitioner and her in-laws for not fulfilling their dowry demands. She had further alleged that her parents had sent an LCD TV worth ₹18,000/-, however, she continued to be harassed. She delivered twins (two girls) and this resulted the petitioner and her parents raising a further demand of ₹2,00,000/-. She alleged that she was not permitted to return to her matrimonial home, if her parents did not arrange ₹2,00,000/-.

3. In addition, she had also alleged that the petitioner was cohabiting with another woman since 08.06.2014 and had left his house.

4. The petitioner did not respond to the notices and was declared a proclaimed offender. He was arrested on 13.06.2019 from Raipur, where he was found running a *parantha* stall near the Railway Station. The petitioner has been in custody since that date.

5. All the prosecution witnesses have been examined before the trial court and the matter is now placed for recording of the petitioner's statement.

6. In view of the above, there is little possibility of the petitioner now influencing any of the witnesses or the trial. However, the petitioner does present risk of flight. He had evaded arrest for over four years and was declared a proclaimed offender.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that the petitioner was not aware of the proceedings as he had left his house and had proceeded to another state. It is also the petitioner's case that he was not in touch with his family members. Admittedly, the petitioner had left his house as that is also an allegation made by the complainant. Although it is difficult to accept that the petitioner was not in touch with his family members, nonetheless, since the petitioner insists that he had distanced himself from his family members on account of another relationship, this Court considers it appropriate to give him the benefit of doubt to that extent.

8. In view of the above, this Court considers it apposite to allow the

present petition and direct that the petitioner be released on bail, subject to the petitioner furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹1,00,000/- with one surety of an equivalent amount to the satisfaction of the concerned trial court. The petitioner shall also ensure that the surety is one of his immediate family members. In addition, the petitioner shall not leave the National Capital Territory of Delhi and ensure that he is available for all proceedings. The petitioner shall also report to the concerned Police Station (PS Uttam Nagar) on every second and fourth Monday of the calendar month, till the conclusion of the proceedings before the trial court.

9. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.
10. Order *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

JANUARY 08, 2020
RK

VIBHU BAKHRU, J