



\$~96

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4359/2023 & CRL.M.A. 35741/2023**

MUNNI

..... Applicant

Through: Mr.Suresh Sisodia, Mr.Sushant
Dongra and Mr.Vikas Singh,
Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr.Aman Usman, APP with
Insp. Umesh Rana
Mr.Pramod Kr. Sharma, Adv.
for Complainant with
complainant in person.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA**

ORDER

%

10.01.2024

1. This application has been filed seeking Anticipatory Bail in FIR No. 1420/2023 registered at Police Station: Nihal Vihar under Sections 498A/304B/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short, 'IPC').

2. In the FIR, it has been alleged that the deceased was married to the son of the applicant on 29.06.2020 and within a period of few days of the marriage, she was harassed by her in-laws, including the applicant herein, for dowry. Specific allegations of demand of Rs.5 lacs have been made against the applicant herein. The deceased died due to hanging on 01.11.2023.



3. The learned counsel for the applicant submits that the allegations made against the applicant are rather vague and, in fact, all family members of the applicant have been tried to be roped in. He submits that the deceased was showing suicidal tendencies, and for the said apprehension, the son of the applicant, that is, the husband of the deceased, had also made a formal complaint at Police Station Nihal Vihar, on 15.11.2022. He submits that the applicant is suffering from Lumbar Spondylosis and the medical record in that regard has been placed on record.

4. On the other hand, the learned APP submits that serious allegations have been levelled against the applicant, and they would require custodial interrogation of the applicant. He submits that on the day prior to the death, the deceased had even called her mother, informing her that her husband and the applicant are demanding a sum of Rs.5 lacs and, in case the father of the deceased is not in a position to give the same, at least, he should send Rs.2-3 lacs immediately, otherwise they would not keep her in the house.

5. He further submits that though pursuant to the Order dated 26.12.2023 passed by this Court granting interim bail to the applicant, the applicant joined the investigation on two dates, further investigation is required.

6. The learned counsel for the applicant, in rejoinder, submits that there is no allegation of a call being made by the deceased to her mother on 31.10.2023 or any time soon before the death of the deceased. He reiterates that the allegations made in the FIR are rather vague and do not give any particulars with respect to the date or the



time when the alleged demand was made. He submits that, therefore, *prima facie* there is no case made out against the applicant.

7. I have considered the submissions made.

8. In view of the serious nature of the allegations that have been levelled against the applicant, and the respondent pleading that they would require custodial interrogation in order to investigate into the allegations made, I do not deem this to be a fit case to release the applicant on anticipatory bail at this stage.

9. It is made clear that any observations made hereinabove shall not prejudice the case of the applicant at any later stage of the proceedings.

10. The Bail Application along with the pending application is disposed of in the above terms.

11. Copy of this Order be given *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

JANUARY 10, 2024/ns

Click here to check corrigendum, if any