




...Petitioner

...Respondent

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J. (Oral)

2. Complainant Jyoti Sharma alleged that her marriage was solemnized with Balram on 31.03.2024 and her parents spent ₹15,00,000/- in the marriage. After 6-7 months of marriage, her mother-in-law and her husband started to taunt her for bringing less dowry. In November 2024, they beat her and forced her to bring ₹5,00,000/- as they were in need of ₹10,00,000/-. On her refusal, she was beaten up by them. She narrated these facts to her father-in-law but even he used to keep an evil eye on her. On 17.01.2025, her father-in-law under the influence of liquor, came to her room, started to tease her and outraged her modesty. When she raised hue and cry, he threatened to kill her. On



CRM-M-57043-2025 (O&M)

-2-

19.01.2025, her father-in-law tried to commit rape with her but her mother-in-law came. She disclosed this fact to her mother and thereafter, her mother and brother brought her to the parental home. After one and a half month, *Panchayat* was convened and matter was compromised. Her husband took her to Gurugram but his behaviour was not cordial. She came back to her matrimonial house to find that her mother-in-law had broken the lock and had taken away her ornaments and clothes. On 06.04.2025, her in-laws quarrelled with her and on 07.04.2025, her family members took her back to the parental house. She prayed that appropriate action be taken against all the accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that marriage of petitioner's son with the complainant was solemnized on 31.03.2024 and on 19.04.2025, petitioner, who was residing separately from the complainant and her husband, issued a public notice in the newspaper disinheriting his son Balram and daughter-in-law from his movable and immovable properties. He further submits that the FIR was registered soon thereafter on 24.08.2020 as a counter blast. Learned counsel further argues that the alleged incident dated 17/19.01.2025 was created only on account of the public notice published in the newspaper. There was delay of about 7-8 months in lodging the FIR. He further submits that petitioner's son Balram had since been enlarged on police bail while his wife was exonerated by the police. It is argued that petitioner had been residing separately from his son and daughter-in-law since 2024 and the FIR was lodged only to harass and humiliate him in compliance of order



dated 13.10.2025, petitioner had joined investigation.

4. Vide order dated 13.10.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail and was directed to join investigation.

5. Learned State counsel on instructions from Investigating Officer submits that petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

6. Petitioner has already joined the investigation pursuant to order of this Court dated 13.10.2025 and her further custodial interrogation is not required. In the circumstances of the case but without commenting on merits, the petition is allowed and order dated dated 13.10.2025, granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made absolute, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

06.11.2025 Ajay Goswami	(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)	
	JUDGE	
	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	Yes/No