IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

26.07.2005

Present: Mr.C.S.Yadav for the petitioner.

Mr.Pawan Sharma for the State.

Bail Application No.783/2005

×

- 1. Petitioner, husband of Simmi seeks anticipatory bail.
- 2. A perusal of the FIR shows a confused Simmi. She starts with the grievance by stating that her father-in-law, Satya Prakash, did not want any dowry. For two months after the marriage, he supported the complainant. Her mother-in-law started

tutoring Simmi's husband who used to beat her. Sisters of her husband used to advise her brother to seek divorce. Taking a somersault against her father-in-law, Simmi goes on to state that her father-in-law and her mother-in-law cheated her. Bo

h started taunting her. Both would tell her that her marriage has not been performed in a good manner. She then introduces one Shobha Rani Arora, describing her as an aunt. She states that Shobha Rani Arora along with her mother-in-law destroyed he

house. She states that when she used to have quarrel with her husband, her mother-in-law and father-in-law with love told her brother that Simmi and her husband should be kept for a month or two in a rented premises. She then proceed to record

page 1 of 3

that her in-laws were bad because they kept her and her husband away from the house. Thereafter she introduces one Pari @ Harish. She states that Pari used to come to her matrimonial house at the tenanted accommodation. He and her husband would

consume liquor. Thereupon, the usual complaints of dowry harassment have been set out.

- 3. The sequential manner in which the complaint stands recorded not only reveals the wishy washy manner in which the complainant has narrated her story, but, a closer look reveals that in all probability it is a case of temperamental difference between the husband and wife.
- 4. I accordingly allow the petition. In the event of arrest, on petitioner furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.5,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, petitioner would be released on bail in FIR No.231/05 P.S. Uttam Nagar.
- 5. It would be a condition of the present order that the petitioner would join the investigation as and when required.
- 6. Needless to state that the anticipatory bail granted would be co-terminus with the decision on the application for regular bail, if any,

page 2 of 3

required to be filed by the petitioner, should a challan be presented against the petitioner. 7. Dasti.

July 26, 2005 PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.