

\$-2 to 4

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

+ Bail Appl. No. 1874/2011

SOURAV BANSAL ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Adv.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI ..... Respondent  
Through Ms. Ritu Gauba, APP for the  
State.  
Mr. R.P. Luthra, Adv. for  
Complainant.  
Insp. Subhash Chander, P.S.  
Shahdara

+ Bail Appl. No. 1875/2011 and Crl. M.A. No. 20082/2011

GAURAV BANSAL ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Adv.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI ..... Respondent  
Through Ms. Ritu Gauba, APP for the  
State.  
Mr. R.P. Luthra, Adv. for  
Complainant.  
Insp. Subhash Chander, P.S.  
Shahdara

+ Bail Appl. No. 1876/2011 and Crl. M.A.No. 20083/2011

MAHESH KUMAR BANSAL ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Adv.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI ..... Respondent  
Through Ms. Ritu Gauba, APP for the  
State.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AMULYA  
Certify that the digital file and  
physical file have been compared and  
the digital data is as per the physical  
file and no page is missing.

(2)

Mr. R.P. Luthra, Adv. for  
Complainant.  
Insp. Subhash Chander, P.S.  
Shahdara

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR**

**ORDER**  
**28.12.2011**

%

Notice.

Learned APP accepts notice.

These are three bail applications preferred by the father-in-law, Mahesh Kumar Bansal, by the husband-Gaurav Bansal and by Mr. Saurav Bansal who is the brother-in-law of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioners states he is not pressing the bail plea qua the father-in-law and the husband; he is restricting it to the unmarried brother-in-law namely Saurav Bansal; contention is that there are general allegations against the brother-in-law who has been categorized in the category of in-laws only and there is no specific allegation against him. The parties i.e. the victim Neha had been married to Gaurav Bansal about one year ago; investigation is still at the initial stage; the MLC Shows that the victim had been brought to the hospital with 95 to 98% burns; the name of the brother-in-law finds mentiond as the person who had brought her to the hospital. Learned APP vehemently under instructions from the IO states that there is no explanation as to why the victim laid burning in her home up to the stage when she had received 95 to 98% burns

before she was taken to the hospital; the role of the brother-in-law is also under investigation; no ground is made out for bail at this stage.

Bail application is rejected.

h

**INDERMEET KAUR, J**

**DECEMBER 28, 2011**  
**rb**