



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

205

CRM-M-51848-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.10.2025

VIKAS

PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Lather, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Mahesh Saxena, Advocate for the complainant.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.109 dated 26.04.2025 under Sections 80(2), 85 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Julana, District Jind. Section 103(1) BNS has been added in the FIR during investigation. This is the first petition for regular bail.

2. Case was registered on complaint of Banti Kumar, who stated that his deceased brother had four daughters. The youngest daughter was taken away by his deceased brother's wife who left them after his brother's death and he had been taking care of the other three daughters. He solemnized marriage of his niece Payal with Vikas s/o Rajbir resident of village Garhwali, District Jind 1 year 4 months ago. After marriage, Vikas started harassing and beating Payal regarding which Payal informed her sister-Kajal. That day on 26.04.2025 at 03:00 P.M., Kajal called him on phone and informed that Payal had committed suicide by hanging. He reached village Garhwali, District Jind along with his family members and found the dead body of Payal on the bed with rope marks around her neck.



CRM-M-51848-2025 (O&M)

Payal had committed suicide due to harassment for dowry by Vikas s/o Rajbir resident of village Garhwali, District Jind.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that allegations of harassment levelled against the petitioner were vague, general, unspecific, bereft of essential details of time and place. In fact, deceased committed suicide out of depression. He further submits that though, the police invoked Section 103(1) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023 in the case, there was no evidence to connect the petitioner with the offence of murder, except for disclosure statement of the petitioner which was not admissible in evidence. Petitioner who was in custody in the case for the last 5 months, thus, deserved to be enlarged on bail.

4. Reply by way of affidavit of Sandeep Kumar, HPS Deputy Superintendent of Police, Jind, District Jind on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that deceased Payal, aged 19, was found dead in suspicious circumstances with marks around her neck following repeated instances of harassment and abuse inflicted by the petitioner in connection with dowry demands. He further argued that the place of occurrence was inspected by Scene of Crime Team and a neck scarf was recovered from the place of occurrence. It was argued that in view of Section 109 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (B.S.A.), 2023, burden was on the petitioner to prove how and under what circumstances, his deceased wife died. Considering the serious nature of the case, there was no ground to release the petitioner on bail.

5. Petitioner is accused of having murdered his wife, in the precincts of the matrimonial home, by strangulating her with a neck scarf (Dupatta). Considering the nature and substance of allegations, the quantum



CRM-M-51848-2025 (O&M)

of punishment that conviction may entail and all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, it is not a fit case to release the petitioner on bail. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

6. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

29.10.2025
harpreet

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No