



\$~4

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4269/2025**

DINESH

.....Applicant

Through: Mr. Siddharth Kapoor and Mr.
Ravi, Advocates.

versus

**STATE OF NCT OF DELHI THROUGH SHO PS AMAN VIHAR
AND ANR**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Raghuinder Verma, APP for
the State with Mr. Aditya Vikram
Singh, Advocate, SI Sumit Tomar,
PS-Aman Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

% **24.03.2026**

1. By virtue of the present application under *Section 482* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**), the applicant seeks grant of anticipatory bail in proceedings arising from FIR No.476/2025 dated 02.09.2025 registered at PS.: Aman Vihar, New Delhi under *Sections 306* of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**IPC**).

2. The present FIR was registered pursuant to order dated 19.08.2025 passed by the learned JMFC, North-West District, Delhi, wherein, *succinctly put* it has been alleged that the (deceased) daughter of the complainant was engaged (*Roka*) to the applicant herein on 08.05.2023, whereafter they both were in constant contact with each other. Further,



that the (deceased) daughter was subjected to continuous mental and physical harassment, unlawful dowry demands by the accused persons as also repeated pressure to establish physical relations before marriage by the applicant, which caused her severe trauma and ultimately led to her committing suicide on 12.06.2023 at 05:15 PM. The (deceased) daughter was taken to the Hospital wherein she was declared dead, the reason being Hydrochloric acid poisoning.

3. During investigation, no Suicide Note was found and the CDR of the (deceased) daughter mobile number disclosed that on the date of the incident at 01:40 PM, the applicant talked to her for about *seventy (70)* minutes.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present FIR and the present case does not satisfy the essential ingredients of the offences alleged against the applicant. In fact, the accusations are vague, unsubstantiated, and devoid of any credible or cogent evidence, and neither the applicant nor any of his family members have ever made any demand for dowry or imposed any condition upon the complainant or her family members at any point of time *qua* the marriage of the applicant and the deceased. Lastly, custodial interrogation of the applicant is unwarranted as the applicant has joined and co-operated with the investigation previously as also undertakes to continue to do so as and when required by the investigating agency.

5. *Per contra*, learned APP for the State relying upon the Status Report, submits that although it is not denied that the applicant has joined the investigation, however, considering that the allegations levelled against the applicant are grave and serious in nature as also since he was



engaged to the deceased and had a long telephonic conversation for more than an hour before the time of the incident, there is an apprehension that if released on bail, he may threaten, influence or pressurise the complainant and/ or the witnesses thereby adversely affecting the ongoing investigation.

6. Upon hearing the learned counsel for applicant and the learned APP, and perusing the documents as also Status Report on record, it bears that no doubt the allegations levelled against the applicant are serious in nature, however, *prima facie* there is nothing credible enough for substantiating the same. None of them are sole factor(s) for rejecting grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant. Moreover, it is equally well settled that for a person to be held guilty for the offence of ‘*abetment of suicide*’ under *Section 306* of the IPC as alleged in the present FIR, there must exist an active/ clear act of instigation/ abetment having a direct and proximate link to the commission of suicide. That, in the present case, is missing, more so, since the only factor relied upon by the prosecution is the telephonic conversation of the applicant with the deceased a few hours before the time of the incident. That, in the considered opinion of this Court, does not satisfy the threshold for rejection of grant of bail to the applicant.

7. In light of the aforesaid, as also since the applicant has admittedly joined investigation and is, in fact, willing to join and participate in the investigation as and when called for, to which he shall remain bound, custodial interrogation of the applicant, thus, is hardly called for. As such, upon due deliberation, this Court is of the opinion that the applicant has been able to satisfy the parameters for grant of anticipatory bail.



8. *Resultantly*, the applicant is granted anticipatory bail in FIR No.476/2025 dated 02.09.2025 registered at PS.: Aman Vihar, New Delhi under *Sections 306* of the IPC, subject to the applicant participating in the investigation, as and when called by the IO. As such, in case of his arrest, the applicant be released on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (*Rupees One Lakh Only*) along with one surety of the like amount by a family member/ friend having no criminal case pending against him/ her and further subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ S.H.O. as also subject to the following conditions:-

- a. Applicant shall ordinarily reside at the address as per the Memo of Parties as mentioned in the present application and shall not leave the NCT of Delhi without prior permission of the concerned Court.
- b. Applicant shall surrender his Passport, if any, to the IO.
- c. Applicant shall join and participate in the investigation as and when called by the IO.
- d. Applicant shall provide all his mobile numbers to the IO concerned which shall be kept in working condition at all times.
- e. Applicant shall not indulge in any criminal activity and shall not contact any of the prosecution witnesses, or tamper with the evidence of the case.

9. Accordingly, the present application, along with the pending application, is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

10. A copy of this order be sent to the concerned S.H.O. for information and compliance thereof.

11. Needless to say, the observations expressed hereinabove, if any,



being tentative in nature, will not come in the way of any subsequent proceedings, which shall be dealt on their own merits.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

MARCH 24, 2026/NA/DA