



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-19492-2025**

**Reserved on: 22<sup>nd</sup> August, 2025**

**Pronounced on: 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2025**

Sunil @ Sheela

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Rajinder Goel, Advocate for  
Mr. Tushar Wadhwa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Hooda, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 651 dated 16.11.2022 registered under Sections 365, 494, 302 and 201 of IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Ganaur, District Sonapat.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Roshni Devi alleging therein that her sister's daughter Monika had passed Ilets exam and had gone to Canada. In January, 2022, the petitioner had called her back to India by inducing her on the pretext of performing marriage with her and now he had abducted her.



Despite making a search for her, they were unable to find her. On her complaint, initially, a case under Section 365 of IPC was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. It was revealed that on 21.01.2022, the petitioner had performed marriage with Monika at Arya Smaj Marriage Trust, Gaziabad. The petitioner was arrested on 02.04.2023. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement on the basis of which, offences under Sections 201, 302 and 494 of IPC read with Section 25 of Arms Act were added. The dead body of victim-Monika was got recovered at the instance of the petitioner from his farm house. It was identified by the complainant and her family members. The victim had been killed by the petitioner and her dead body had been concealed by him only. He suffered another disclosure statement and got recovered the weapon of offence. After completion of usual formalities of investigation, challan was presented against the petitioner and he is facing trial for commission of offences of abduction and murder of the victim.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The allegations levelled against him are totally false and vague. In fact, the petitioner was in love with the victim and had performed marriage with her. During the subsistence of his first marriage, the family of the victim was against this marriage though they were well aware of factum of performing marriage by the deceased with the petitioner. The family of the deceased had extended threats to both of them. Subsequently, they represented to the petitioner and the deceased that they had accepted their marriage and had prevailed Monika to come to her house so that they could perform the rituals of her marriage with the petitioner. It



was only by trusting the family of the complainant that the deceased had gone back to her maternal house and immediately thereafter the petitioner was arrested by the police. In fact, it is case of honour killing. The farm house from where the dead body was recovered does not belong to the petitioner. He has been in custody since 02.04.2023. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. There is no eye-witness to the murder of the victim. The case rests upon circumstantial evidence and there is no evidence to connect him with the crime. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have enticed the victim Monika to come back to India and is further alleged to have performed marriage with her despite the fact that he is already married and was having children. The petitioner is alleged to have murdered the victim and concealed her dead body in a farm house. The dead body of the victim was exhumed at the instance of the petitioner. The allegations against the petitioner are quite grave in nature. The trial is going on at a proper pace and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the



same. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations, quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

7. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]  
JUDGE

1<sup>st</sup> September, 2025  
Parveen Sharma

- |                               |   |          |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable         | : | Yes / No |