



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

CRM-M-63008-2024

Date of Decision:27.10.2025

SHRIKANT GUPTA

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Deepinder Singh Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.0151 dated 17.02.2024 under Sections 302, 323, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Yamuna Nagar.

2. The present FIR has been lodged at the instant of Sarita alleging that her husband Sri Kant Gupta, father-in-law Vinay Gupta, and others conspired to call her and her father to Yamuna Nagar with the intention to kill them. It is alleged that on 15.02.2024, at around 5:00 p.m., at the residence of a known person, the accused persons, namely Vinay Gupta, Sri Kant Gupta, and their associates, attacked the complainant and her father, abused them, made obscene gestures, and mercilessly beat her father Om Parkash, causing grievous injuries that later resulted in his death during treatment. The complainant further stated that despite a prior written settlement dated 17.12.2023 at Police Station Jind regarding matrimonial issues arising out of her marriage with Sri Kant Gupta solemnized on 02.09.2017, the accused failed to comply with the agreed terms. She alleges



that her in-laws, including Usha Gupta (mother-in-law), Vikrant Gupta (jeth), Vandana Gupta (jethani), Prashant Aggarwal (brother-in-law), and Shaifali Aggarwal (sister-in-law), are also part of the conspiracy to destroy her matrimonial life and eliminate her and her father. Hence, the FIR.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had been falsely implicated in the present case and has submitted that as per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner had been alleged to have given kicks and fists blows to the deceased. He further submits that the allegations made in the FIR have not been medically corroborated as neither the injuries have been found in the MLR and nor in the post-mortem report. He further submits that the father of the petitioner against whom there are similar allegations had already been released by this Court vide order dated 23.08.2024 passed in CRM-M-40223-2024 titled as Vinay Gupta Vs. State of Haryana. He further submits that the petitioner was granted interim bail vide order dated 27.01.2025 passed by this Court and has not misused the concession of interim bail, which deserved to be made absolute. He further contended that from the facts and circumstances of the case, no case for offences under Section 302 IPC is made out.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the deceased was 62 years of age and there are specific allegations made against the petitioner having been given kicks and fists blow. He, on instructions from ASI Tejbir Singh, submits that out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only 06 witnesses have been examined and the complainant has only been partly examined. He



has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the contentions raised by learned Senior counsel to the present petition is whether the petitioner could be prosecuted for offences under under Section 302 IPC. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The Court would refrain from going into the contentions raised at this stage as the same would lie in the domain of the trial Court on the appreciation of evidences led by both the sides. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned Senior counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 27.01.2025 is made absolute and he is ordered to be released on bail subject to already furnished bail/surety bonds. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

27.10.2025

kv

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