

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

**26.07.2005**

**Present: Mr.M.S.Multani for the petitioner.  
Mr.Pawan Sharma for the State.**

**CrI.M (M) 5102/2003**

\*

1. Petitioner No.1 is the husband of the complainant. Petitioners 2 and 3 are father-in-law and mother-in-law respectively.

2. Marriage took place in the year 1994. Two children were born to the couple.

3. Complaint, pursuant whereto FIR has been registered against the petitioners alleges dowry harassment from day one of the marriage. It is stated in the complaint that petitioner No.1 abandoned the complainant and her children. He went to Saudi Arabia. As per the complainant, petitioner No.1 was earning approx. Rs.40,000/- per month.

4. Allegations of dowry harassment are general. These are without material particulars.

5. Petitioner No.1 is settled in India. He is residing in Bijnor.

6. Today in court, petitioner No.1 states that the complainant is welcome to live with him at Bijnaur. The complainant, who is also  
page 1 of 3

personally present, states that she fears for her life at Bijnor. She states that she is not ready to live with the petitioner at Bijnor.

7. On being questioned, petitioner No.1 states that he was in Saudi Arabia for a short while. He was cheated by his employer there. He did not receive his salary.

8. Order dated 23.3.2004 records that at one stage, complainant stated that her dowry articles were worth Rs.1 lakh and that the petitioner No.1 had paid Rs.50,000/- to the complainant.

9. Taking into consideration the fact that the petitioners have paid a sum of Rs.50,000/- to the complainant and that the FIR has general allegations, petition stands disposed of with a direction that in the event of arrest, on petitioners furnishi

ng a personal bond in the sum of Rs.5,000/- each with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, petitioners would be released on bail in FIR No.161/03 P.S. Jhangirpuri.

10. It would be a condition of the present order that the petitioners would join the investigation as and when required.

11. 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 petitioners, should a challan be presented against the petitioners.

Dasti.

**July 26, 2005 PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.**

**pu**

**page 3 of 3**