



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

225

CRM-M-26385-2025

Date of decision : 23.09.2025

Sudhir

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Satish K. Birla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, A.A.G., Haryana.

None for the complainant.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.212 dated 22.05.2022 registered under Sections 304-B, 328, 34, 406, 201 & 498-A of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Hathin, District Palwal.

2. Status report/compliance report by way of an affidavit of Sh. Mohinder Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hathin, District Palwal, on behalf of the respondent-State, filed in the Registry is taken on record.

3. Brief facts of the case are that on 22.05.2022, brother of the deceased-Sheetal moved a complaint to the police alleging therein that his sister was married to accused Sudhir (the present petitioner) on 16.02.2021. Sufficient dowry was given in marriage but her in-laws were not satisfied with the same. Accused Sudhir, Kumarpal, Bala and

**CRM-M-26385-2025****2**

Vinod started demanding dowry from his sister. His sister asked him several times that her in-laws are harassing her on account of dowry demand and they may even kill her. On 21.05.2022 at about 10:00 P.M., he received an information that his sister has been given poison by the accused. Thereafter, he went to the Guru Nank Hospital, Palwal, where his sister was admitted in ICU. Today i.e. on 22.05.2022, his sister expired during treatment. The accused persons have murdered his sister by administering poison to her. On the basis of said complaint, the instant FIR was registered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The allegations levelled in the FIR are vague and baseless as there was no dowry demand or harassment on the part of the petitioner. He submits that the complainant and other material witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution. The complainant (brother of deceased-Sheetal), who has been examined before the Trial Court as PW-3, has stated in his statement that his sister used to remain ill and on receiving the information of her death, he reached the hospital. He further stated that the petitioner and other accused persons are not responsible for the death of his sister. To the similar effect is the statement of PW-2 Ram Lal, cousin brother of the deceased.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is behind the bars since 26.10.2024. He also submits that investigation in the present case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of total 18 prosecution witnesses,

**CRM-M-26385-2025****3**

only 04 have been examined so far. The trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude and therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind the bars.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel, while referring to the averments made in the status report, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The petitioner used to harass the deceased on account of non-fulfillment of demand of dowry. However, he could not refute the factual position that out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, 04 have been examined. He has also filed custody certificate dated 22.09.2025 in the Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is behind the bars since more than last ten months. Learned State counsel further submits that the petitioner is also involved in two other cases.

7. In response thereto, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that out of two other cases, in one case the petitioner has already been discharged and in another case he is on bail.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

9. Keeping in view the custody period of the petitioner which is 10 months and 26 days and the facts that the complainant and other material witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution before the Trial Court; investigation has been completed; challan has been presented; charges have been framed and out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, only 04 have been examined so far and the trial may take a



CRM-M-26385-2025

4

considerable time to conclude, therefore, the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail during trial on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court.

- 10. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.
- 11. 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.

23.09.2025
kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No