



\$~5 & 6

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

CNR No. DLHC010263462026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2274/2026**

VIRENDER KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Binisa Mohanty, Mr. Akshay Kumar, Ms. Manu Kaushal and Mr. Shashank Singh, Advs.

versus

THE STATE OF GNCT DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State.
Ms. Sapna Kaushik, Adv. for complainant.
W/SI Manisha, PS Nihal Vihar.

~6

CNR No. DLHC010264012026

+ **BAIL APPLN. 2287/2026**

GEETA DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Binisa Mohanty, Mr. Akshay Kumar, Ms. Manu Kaushal and Mr. Shashank Singh, Advs.

versus

THE STATE OF GNCT DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State.
Ms. Sapna Kaushik, Adv. for complainant.
W/SI Manisha, PS Nihal Vihar.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

20.08.2026

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present application has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the 'BNSS') seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioners in **FIR No. 458/2025**



registered at Police Station Nihal Vihar, West Delhi, for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 85 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the 'BNS'). The petitioners are the parents-in-law of the deceased.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been in judicial custody since 18.10.2025 and are in their late 50s. They are the father-in-law and mother-in-law of the deceased. She submits that the transcript relied upon by the prosecution, recording the conversation between the deceased, her husband and her parents-in-law, does not disclose any demand for dowry having been made by the petitioners prior to the death of the deceased.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that, rather, even in the complaint lodged by the father of the deceased, it has been stated that the husband of the deceased had called the mother of the deceased and informed her that the deceased was threatening to consume poison. When the deceased did not answer her mother's call, her mother contacted the husband of the deceased, who informed her that he was not at home and that, upon reaching the house, he would connect her with the deceased. Subsequently, upon reaching the house, the husband informed her that the deceased had consumed something and that they were taking her to the hospital.

5. It is further submitted that neither the complaint nor the transcript contains any specific allegation of the deceased having been subjected to cruelty or harassment on account of a demand for dowry by the petitioners. It is submitted that the petitioners have been implicated in the offences under Sections 498A/304B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, merely on the basis of general allegations.



6. *Per contra*, learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the complainant submits that immediately prior to her death, the deceased had called her mother, during which conversation the mother recorded the conversation taking place between the deceased, her husband and her parents-in-law.

7. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that, in the said conversation, both the petitioners, *i.e.* the father-in-law and mother-in-law of the deceased, were asking the deceased to pack her belongings and leave the matrimonial home.

8. Learned APP for the State further submits that the call recording makes it clear that, immediately prior to her death, the deceased was given an ultimatum by her husband as well as her in-laws to pack her belongings and leave the matrimonial home.

9. The Court has heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the complainant.

10. The marriage between the deceased and the husband was solemnised on 25.04.2025, whereas the deceased died on 24.06.2025, *i.e.* within a period of approximately two months of the marriage.

11. The transcript of the conversation between the deceased, her husband and her parents-in-law is also on record. The said conversation is stated to have been recorded immediately prior to the death of the deceased and is relied upon by the prosecution as material evidence in support of the allegations of cruelty and harassment.

12. Further, in the complaint lodged by the father of the deceased, there are allegations that the deceased was subjected to demands of dowry by her matrimonial family soon after her marriage.



13. At this stage, the allegations against the petitioners, the proximity between the marriage and the death of the deceased, and the material relied upon by the prosecution, including the aforesaid transcript, require consideration during trial.

14. Learned counsel for the complainant further submits that the aforesaid transcript does not form part of the original FIR/complaint.

15. Having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that the deceased died within a period of two months of her marriage and the nature of the allegations as well as the material collected during investigation, no ground for grant of bail is made out at this stage.

16. Accordingly, the present application is dismissed. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

17. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

MADHU JAIN, J

AUGUST 20, 2026/b/P