

\$~5

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 118/2020

PARVEZ

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vijay Kinger and Ms. Roopa Nagpal and Mr. Varun Pawar, Advocates.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State with SI Mamta and Insp. Ratnesh Kumar, New Usmanpur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNISH BHATNAGAR

ORDER

%

19.02.2020

1. Amended memo of parties has been filed.
2. Status report has been filed.
3. In the present case, the petitioner is seeking bail in case FIR No. 684/2019 under Section 376/506 IPC, registered at P.S.New Usmanpur, Delhi.
4. In brief, the facts of the case are that on the statement of Mehnaz D/o Mohd. Zahid an FIR bearing no. 684/2019 was registered, in which she has stated that there is a band shop in front of

her house, where one boy namely Parvez, petitioner herein was doing work. She got friendly with Parvez alone three years back. She went out with Parvez many times for travel. She also visited the house of Parvez situated at Gali No.24, Gautampuri, Delhi. One day (about three years ago) she went to the house of petitioner and then petitioner locked the door from inside and established physical relation with her without her consent. He also threatened her and not to tell anyone. After that, she also established physical relation with her many times on the promise of marriage. After sometime, the petitioner denied to marry her. As per her statement the abovementioned case was registered. The petitioner was arrested on 9.12.2019 and sent to judicial custody and still is running in judicial custody. Accused has also filed an anticipatory bail application on 4.11.2019 before the trial court on the ground that he has solemnized marriage with the complainant on 13.10.2019 and they are living together.

5. Respondent no.2-complainant is present in person along with her parents-in-law namely Mehnaz Mehsar (saas) and Murad Ali (sasur). It is submitted by the complainant that she got married with the petitioner on 13.10.2019 and now she is living with her parents-in-law. She has no objection if the bail is granted to the petitioner.

6. Ld. APP for the State has vehemently opposed the bail application.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, and the factum of marriage between the complainant and the petitioner, petitioner is admitted to bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the

satisfaction of the trial court concerned.

Dasti.

FEBRUARY 19, 2020/ib

RAJNISH BHATNAGAR, J