

Roshini vs.state

Roshini vs.state

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1216485

Court : Delhi

Decided On : Jul-27-2018

Appellant : Roshini

Respondent : State

Judgement :

\$~12 * IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI Judgment delivered on:

27. 07.2018 % BAIL APPLN. 139/2018 ROSHINI STATE versus

... Petitioner

..... Respondent Advocates who appeared in this case: For the

... Petitioner

For the Respondent CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA Mr. Sidharth Tyagi, Adv. Mr. Panna Lal Sharma, Addl. PP for the State with ASI Ram Dev : : %

ORDER

2707.2018 SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J.

(ORAL) 1. The petitioner seeks anticipatory Bail in case FIR No.558 of 2017 under Sections 328/3

of the IPC Police Station Bhalswa Dairy, Delhi.

2. The petitioner is the sister of the mother-in-law of the complainant. The mother in law has expired. The allegations against the petitioner are that the petitioner alongwith the husband of the complainant had administered bed bug repellent to her consequent to a quarrel that took place on account of the complainant having switched off the CCTV camera installed at the house of the complainant. BAIL APPLN. 139/2018 Page 1 of 2 3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated as the CCTV footage clearly shows that the petitioner was not even present in the house and does not support the allegations made in the FIR and does corroborate the incident as narrated by the complainant in the FIR. It is submitted that the petitioner does not even live with I the house of the complainant.

4. Learned Addl. PP informs that the investigation is complete and chargesheet has also been filed.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the case and on perusal of the records, I am of the view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, it is directed that in the event of arrest, the arresting officer/IO/SHO shall release the petitioner on bail on her furnishing a bail bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Investigating Officer/SHO concerned. The petitioner shall not do anything, which may prejudice either trial or the prosecution witnesses.

7. 8. The Petition is disposed of in the above terms. Order Dasti under signatures of the Court Master SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J JULY27 2018/rs BAIL APPLN. 139/2018 Page 2 of 2