\$~4

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

+ BAIL APPLN. 1317/2016

KAMALJEET ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Davinder Hora, Mr. Sikandar

Khan, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF N.C.T OF DELHI ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Raghuvinder Verma, APP for

State.

**CORAM:** 

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE I.S.MEHTA

ORDER

% 29.06.2016

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in case FIR No. 204/2016, P.S. Jahangirpuri, under Section 498 A/406/34 IPC. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner was granted anticipatory bail three times earlier.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that he has already returned the admitted articles of the complainant under the signatures of the complainant before the CAW Cell, which is vehemently opposed by the complainant, who is present in person.

The interim anticipatory bail application of the petitioner was lastly rejected on 13<sup>th</sup> June, 2016 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge on the ground that petitioner has not joined the investigation. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this fact was wrong represented.

On the other hand, learned APP for State vehemently opposes the bail application of the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has not joined

the investigation despite the interim anticipatory bail application granted in his favour by the court below and the same was rejected by the court below on 13<sup>th</sup> June, 2016.

Learned APP on the instructions of the complainant, who is present in person submits that streedhan is yet to be recovered from the present petitioner and submitted that the petitioner is taking undue advantage of the judicial process.

Keeping in view the fact and circumstances and the fact that the petitioner despite being granted three times anticipatory bail by the court below, jumped over the interim bail conditions and there is allegation that streedhan has not yet been returned completely, the conduct of the petitioner indicates that either he wants to harass the complainant for his own interest or is trying to take undue advantage of the judicial process. Consequently, I find no merit in the present anticipatory bail application and the same is rejected.

I.S.MEHTA (VACATION BENCH)

JUNE 29, 2016