



\$~3

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 3925/2024**

MOHIT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. S.G. Goswami and Mr. Ravish
Kumar, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
Counsel for complainant (presence
not given).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

14.11.2024

%

1. By way of present application, the applicant seeks regular bail in FIR No.341/2024 registered under Sections 498-A /304B IPC at P.S. Kalyanpuri, Delhi.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner/applicant submits that the present FIR came to be registered on 16.06.2024. He submits that in the present case, the marriage between the parties was solemnized on 12.08.2017 and the deceased had committed suicide on 10.06.2024. It is further submitted that at the time of the death of the deceased, the deceased was living in her parental home. It is further stated that in the statement recorded during the inquest proceedings, no specific allegations have been made out against the present applicant. Lastly, it is stated that the applicant is in custody since 28.08.2024.
3. The present bail application is resisted by learned APP for the State duly assisted by learned counsel for the complainant. It is stated that the deceased had been staying at her parental home for four months prior to the



incident on account of the continuous harassment meted out at the hands of the applicant and his family members. It is also informed that the applicant is also involved in another case. It is further stated that the case is still at the stage of investigation.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. The present case came to be registered on the statement of *Ms. Kiran Kaur*, the mother of the deceased. The statement before the SDM came to be followed by her supplementary statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.PC. In her said statement, the complainant had stated that the deceased was harassed by the applicant and more particularly, 4/5 days prior to her death, the applicant had visited the parental house of the deceased and demanded a four-wheeler. The applicant had on an earlier occasion demanded a scooty which was purchased by the complainant and given to the applicant. The EMIs were also paid by the complainant. However, subsequently looking at the behaviour of the applicant, the scooty was taken back. The statements of the brother and sister of the deceased is also cumulative to the statement of the complainant, who have also stated that the applicant had visited the parental house of the deceased 4/5 days prior to her death.

6. For all of the aforementioned reasons, I find no ground to entertain the present bail application and the same is accordingly dismissed.

7. Needless to state that nothing observed hereinabove shall amount to an expression on the merits of the case and shall not have a bearing on the trial of the case as the same has been expressed only for the purpose of the disposal of the present bail application.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

NOVEMBER 14, 2024/rd