



\$~3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **BAIL APPLN. 397/2025 & CRL.M.A. 2826/2025**
SUDHIR KUMARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Kedar Yadav, Mr. Sharun Daniel,
Mr. Rahul Yadav and Ms. Minakshi
Yadav, Advocates with Petitioner (in-
Person).

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP.
SI Paramjeet, P.S. Ranhola.
Mr. Kapil Bhardwaj, Advocate for
complainant.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
27.03.2025

%

1. The present petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeks grant of regular bail in case of FIR No. 704/2024 under Sections 110/351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023, registered at PS: Ranhola.

2. The case of the prosecution is as follows:

2.1. A PCR call was received at PS Ranhola *vide* GD No. 31A dated 29th September, 2024 regarding quarrel and the same was marked to Investigating Officer¹ for necessary action.

2.2. When the IO reached the place of incident along with staff, he

¹ "IO"



discovered that the victims/injured persons have already gone to Sanjay Gandhi Memorial Hospital, Mangolpuri for treatment.

2.3. After reaching the hospital, the victim Rukma Devi was treated as per MLC No. 19835/24 wherein the doctor documented 2x0.5x0.5 cm wound on forehead; victim Ravinder was treated as per MLC No. 19834/24 wherein the doctor had documented 1.5x0.5x0.5 cm wound on mid occipital region; and victim Pooja Devi was treated as per MLC No. 19878/24 wherein the doctor had documented 1x0.5x0.5 cm wound on left parietal region.

2.4. The Complainant Rukma Devi visited PS Ranhola on 30th September, 2024 and got her statement recorded wherein she stated that on 29th September, 2024 her son-in-law Sudhir came to their house to talk to his wife Pooja but after a while he started shouting on her. When the complainant and her husband tried to pacify things, the accused person Sudhir grabbed a wooden stick and started beating all three of them.

2.5. During the course of investigation, the CCTV footage covering the street of the complainant was obtained wherein the accused person can be seen running from the house of the complainant.

2.6. During the course of investigation, the statement of victim Pooja was recorded wherein she stated that she had filed a complaint against her husband in CAW Cell for Domestic Violence.

2.7. The accused person was arrested on dated 28th October, 2024 and the weapon of offence i.e. wooden stick was recovered at his instance and then he was produced before the MM and sent to Judicial Custody.

2.8. The Complainant handed over the clothes worn by the injured persons to the IO which were taken into Police Possession through Seizure Memo and deposited in PS Malkhana.



2.9. The weapon of offence was sent to Dept. of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology for obtaining opinion of the doctor. The doctor opined that “injuries mentioned in MLC No 19834/24, 19835/24, 19878/24 numbers above are possible by danda examined or similar one”.

2.10. The opinion on nature of injury was obtained and the doctor classified the injuries to be Simple in nature.

2.11. During the course of investigation, the blood samples of all the victims were also collected and seized through seizure memo and the exhibits i.e. clothes, danda and blood samples were sent to FSL, Rohini.

2.12. The chargesheet has been filed before the Trial Court and the case is at the stage of framing of charge and the next date of hearing is fixed for 01st May, 2025.

3. The Applicant, the wife of the Applicant, as well as the Complainant are present in person. Counsel for Complainant submits that the allegations in the FIR have emerged on account of matrimonial dispute between the Applicant and his wife (Complainant’s daughter). The Applicant went to the house of the Complainant in order to request his wife to return to her home; however heated exchanges took place between the Applicant and his wife and thereafter his in-laws (parents of his wife), started beating the Applicant. During this scuffle, her husband and his wife (daughter of the complainant) sustained some injuries due to their own act.

4. Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for State, strongly opposes the bail application, however, acknowledges the fact that the nature of the injuries suffered by the complainant were simple in nature.

5. The Court has considered the aforementioned contentions. On 30th January, 2025, the Court had granted interim bail to the Applicant. The Complainant



(mother-in-law) of the Applicant as well as his wife, who are present in the Court, do not oppose the bail application and state that they have resolved their disputes amicably.

6. Considering the nature of offences and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the Applicant is directed to be released on regular bail on furnishing a personal bond for a sum of ₹25,000/- with one surety of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty MM, on the following conditions:

- a. The Applicant shall cooperate in any further investigation as and when directed by the concerned IO;
- b. The Applicant shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case, in any manner whatsoever;
- c. The Applicant shall under no circumstance leave the country without the permission of the Trial Court;
- d. The Applicant shall appear before the Trial Court as and when directed;
- e. The Applicant shall provide the address where he would be residing after his release and shall not change the address without informing the concerned IO/ SHO;
- f. The Applicant shall, upon his release, give his mobile number to the concerned IO/SHO and shall keep his mobile phone switched on at all times.
- g. The Applicant shall report to the concerned PS on first Friday of every month;
- h. In the event of there being any FIR/DD entry / complaint lodged against the Applicant, it would be open to the State to seek redressal by



filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.

7. It is clarified that any observations made in the present order are for the purpose of deciding the present bail application and should not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. The bail application is allowed in the afore-mentioned terms.

9. Copy of the order be sent to the concerned Jail Superintendent, for necessary information and compliance.

10. The bail application stands disposed of along with pending applications.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 27, 2025

as