



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

CRM-M-21110-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:29.04.2025

Mohit

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Kumar Lathwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.318 dated 23.09.2023 under Sections 304-B, 34 of IPC (Charge framed in 304-B, 34 in alternative under Section 302 of IPC) registered at Police Station Sonipat Bahalgarh, District Sonipat, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for about 01 year and 07 months. He submitted that only the examination-in-chief of the complainant has been conducted. Thereafter, an application under Section 319 of the Code of Criminal Procedure was moved by the prosecution, which has since been dismissed and now the case is fixed for cross-examination of the complainant. He submitted that the allegations in the present case are pertaining to causing dowry death and accordingly, charges under Section 304-B of the Indian Penal Code and in the alternative, under



Section 302 IPC, were framed. He further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, as there was no occasion for the petitioner to have killed his own wife. He also submitted that since the custody of the petitioner is now 01 year and 07 months the petitioner may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel on instructions of ASI Subhash, submitted that insofar as the custody of the petitioner is concerned, the same is correct and as per the instructions, only the examination-in-chief of the complainant has been conducted. He further submitted that considering the allegations levelled in the present FIR, wherein a specific role has been attributed to the petitioner and specific allegations of dowry have also been made, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail, keeping in view the seriousness and gravity of the offence.

4. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

5. As per the learned counsels for the parties, only the examination-in-chief of the complainant has been conducted and the case before the trial court is now pending for cross-examination of the complainant. As per the allegations, the death of wife of the petitioner had occurred within a period of seven months of marriage, however, as per the learned State counsel, the death had occurred within a period of ten months. The FIR contains specific allegations against the petitioner in this regard. Therefore, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the seriousness and gravity of the offence, as well as the present stage of trial,



this Court does not deem it fit and proper to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

7. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and is meant for the purpose of deciding the present petition only.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

29.04.2025

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No