

\$~2 & 3

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2631/2019 & CRL.M.A. 36043/2019**

SH. AMIT JAIN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Prosenjeet Banerjee and Mr Ninad
Dogra, Advocates.

versus

STATE

..... Respondent

Through: Ms Kamna Vohra, ASC for state with
W/SI Yaonai Paohow, PS S. J.
Enclave.
Mr Prashant Mendiratta, Advocate for
R-2.
Mr Prashant Mendiratta, Advocate for
complainant.

AND

3.

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2634/2019 & CRL.MA 36050/2019**

SMT. GAURAV RAJENDER JAIN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Prosenjeet Banerjee and Mr Ninad
Dogra, Advocates.

versus

STATE AND ANOTHER

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Kamna Vohra, ASC for state with
W/SI Yaonai Paohow, PS S. J.
Enclave.
Mr Prashant Mendiratta, Advocate for
R-2.
Mr Prashant Mendiratta, Advocate for
complainant.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER
% 17.02.2020

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that FIR No.0259/2018, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC registered with PS Safdarjung Enclave and all proceedings emanating therefrom, be quashed.
2. The petitioners state that the FIR has been filed at the instance of respondent no.2. Mr Banerjee, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contends that the FIR does not disclose any allegation against the petitioners and, therefore, the FIR qua the petitioners, requires to be quashed.
3. It is seen that the FIR contains the following assertions made by the complainant:

“In May 2016, my parents had gone to civil lines per dadaji's request and Gaurav as well as Amit abused my parents saying that if you didn't have the capacity to give us all the money, then why did you make false promises. They mistreated my parents the entire time while they were in civil lines.

For 4 years while Abhishek and I stayed in SF, Amit and Gaurav never visited us even once. However, the minute they found out about our marital problems, they flew down to SF to help assist Abhishek in meeting lawyers to initiate the divorce process.”

4. It is well settled that the FIR does not have to set out allegations in any detail and a brief statement of the same, is sufficient.

5. In the present case, the allegations that the parents of respondent no.2 had been mistreated and had been abused on account of them not paying the money demanded of them, is sufficient to sustain the registration of the FIR.
6. Next, Mr Banerjee submits that since the said allegations do not allege any mistreatment of the complainant, but of her parents, the petitioners cannot be considered as subjecting the complainant to cruelty.
7. The said contention is unpersuasive. Abusive conduct towards the parents of a woman, on account of demand of dowry, would in the given circumstances, also tantamount to the woman being subjected to cruelty.
8. Abusing parents or immediate family members of a woman, would in a given situation be sufficient to torment her.
9. This Court finds the present petition without merit. The petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.
10. The pending applications are also disposed of.

FEBRUARY 17, 2020
MK

VIBHU BAKHRU, J