



\$~58

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4129/2025**

SMT. DIMPY CHUGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. SC Buttan, Mr. Himanshu Buttan
and Mr. Nikhil Thakran, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
State with SI Mohit Bamel, PS:
Begumpur.
Mr. Gagan Bhatnagar, Advocate for
R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

31.10.2025

CRL.M.A. 32119/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

BAIL APPLN. 4129/2025

3. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 553/2025, registered at Police Station Shalimar Begumpur, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 80/85/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter 'BNS').

4. Brief facts of the case, are that a PCR call was received on 22.08.2025 regarding a case of commission of suicide by a woman. Upon visiting the



place of the incident, the police had found Ms. Nikita Gambhir, aged 25 years, lying on the bed. After inspecting the spot, the body of the deceased was shifted to Sanjay Gandhi Hospital, where she was declared "brought dead" vide MLC No. 24770/25. No suicide note was found at the spot. During investigation, it came to light that the deceased was married to co-accused Sourav on 18.04.2024; and as she had died an unnatural death, the SDM, Kanjhawala was informed. On 23.08.2025, the SDM recorded the statements of the family members of the deceased, wherein they alleged that the deceased had committed suicide due to persistent harassment for non-fulfilment of demand of dowry and cruelty at the hands of her husband, in-laws, and other relatives. The mother and brother of the deceased alleged that the deceased's husband, along with his parents, brothers Gaurav and Rahul, and their wives Dimpy and Akansha, had been continuously demanding articles and had subjected her to beatings and torture whenever the demands were not met. They further alleged that recently, the deceased was being harassed on account of the illegal demand for a Scorpio car. It was specifically alleged that on 12.08.2025 and 13.08.2025, the deceased had been beaten by her husband on the instigation of his family members and was thrown out of the matrimonial home with a warning that she would be allowed to return only when her family fulfilled the demand of a Scorpio car. Her mobile phone had also been withheld by the in-laws. Unfortunately, she committed suicide by hanging herself, in her parental home, on 22.08.2025. The postmortem of the deceased was conducted on 24.08.2025, and thereafter, on the recommendation of the Executive Magistrate, the present FIR was registered.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the present accused/applicant



argues that the applicant is a mother of two minor children, aged 8 and 3 years, who has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is argued that the applicant was residing with her husband Gaurav Sahni on the first floor of the property, and had no interference in the lives of the deceased and her husband (i.e. Sourav Sahni) who lived on the third floor. The learned counsel also argues that the applicant had joined the investigation once on 30.08.2025, and thereafter, no further intimation was received by her from the Investigating Officer (I.O.) to join the investigation again. It is also contended that the deceased did not file any complaint immediately after 13.08.2025 (i.e. when she left her matrimonial home) and the incident took place about 9 days after the deceased had left her matrimonial home, and thus, there was no instigation by the accused persons. It is further argued that the co-accused Aakansha (who is also the sister-in-law of the deceased, like the present applicant) has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, and the allegations against the applicant stand on the same footing as those against the said co-accused. Thus, it is prayed that the applicant/accused be granted anticipatory bail.

6. The learned APP for the State, on the other hand, argues that the allegations against the applicant are serious in nature, and within 15 months of marriage, the deceased died under unnatural circumstances, and it is evident from the statements of the witnesses that she had been tortured and harassed for demand of dowry. It is further argued that the grounds on which the co-accused Aakansha was granted anticipatory bail are distinguishable, and therefore, the present applicant does not deserve to be granted bail on the ground of parity. The learned APP for the State also argues that Non-Bailable Warrants (NBWs) have also been issued against the applicant.



Accordingly, it is prayed that the accused/applicant be not granted anticipatory bail.

7. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State, and has perused the record.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant has argued that on the ground of parity, the applicant herein is entitled to bail inasmuch as co-accused Aakansha has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, who is also the wife of one of the brothers of the husband of the deceased. This Court, however, takes note of the fact that there exists a clear and significant distinction between the role attributed to the present applicant and that of co-accused Aakansha. In the case of co-accused Aakansha, who has been granted bail, the material on record, including the transcripts of telephonic conversations between the deceased and her mother, revealed that she had expressed sympathy towards the deceased, had disapproved of the conduct of other family members, and had even shared that she herself had faced similar treatment in the house after her marriage. In other words, there was no material to suggest her participation in harassment or cruelty towards the deceased. *Whereas, in contrast*, as far as the present applicant Dimpy is concerned, there are specific allegations against her of having made dowry-related demands from the deceased. The mother and brother of the deceased have categorically stated that the applicant had taunted the deceased, saying that it was a mistake to have her married into their family and that they could have received much better dowry elsewhere, calling the deceased “*kangaal*” (poor) and remarking that she had brought nothing with her. It has also been specifically alleged that the applicant used to ill-treat and



harass the deceased, even depriving her of food. Therefore, in view of these allegations, the plea of parity does not arise in the present case, as the role attributed to the present applicant stands on an entirely different footing.

9. It has also been contended on behalf of the applicant that she used to reside on the first floor of the house, whereas the deceased was residing with her husband on the third floor. However, the mere fact that they occupied different floors in the same house does not, by itself, absolve the applicant of the allegations. The entire family was living together under one roof, and therefore, their physical proximity, regular interaction, and consequently, harassment of the deceased by the applicant cannot be ruled out on this ground alone.

10. In the present case, the material on record, including statements recorded under Section 180 of the BNSS, indicates that the deceased had been subjected to persistent harassment for dowry. The mother of the deceased has specifically stated that at the time of marriage, the applicant's family had demanded gold ornaments and ₹10 lakhs in cash, and later, in January 2025, upon the birth of the deceased's first child, a further demand for a Scorpio car was made by the father-in-law and brothers-in-law, including the present applicant. When the family of the deceased had expressed their inability to meet such demand, the deceased had continued to face taunts and threats, leading her parents to even encash a fixed deposit of ₹3.50 lakhs and transfer the amount to her account. However, despite this, the deceased was continuously harassed, humiliated, and threatened with dire consequences for non-fulfilment of the demand for a car.

11. Further, the transcripts of telephonic conversations between the



deceased and her mother on 12.08.2025 and 13.08.2025 corroborate the allegations of severe cruelty and harassment. The deceased had stated that her husband had beaten her mercilessly, thrown her out of the car on a road, and taken away her mobile phone, which had compelled her to borrow a stranger's phone to call her mother. She also told her mother that her husband had threatened to get her beaten by his brother, and that she intended to go to the police station to lodge a complaint. These conversations, made just a few days prior to her death, *prima facie* indicate that the deceased had been subjected to physical and mental cruelty in connection with dowry demands.

12. In view of the above facts, this Court finds that the allegations against the present applicant are serious, specific, and supported by material collected during investigation. Despite being served notices to join the investigation on 05.09.2025, 08.09.2025 and 14.09.2025, the applicant has failed to join the investigation. Non-Bailable Warrants were issued against the applicant on 15.09.2025, and proceedings under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. have also been initiated against her. Therefore, no ground is made out to grant the applicant the benefit of anticipatory bail at this stage.

13. Accordingly, the bail application stands dismissed.

14. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed herein above shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

15. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 31, 2025/vc