



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

106

CRM-M-61906-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 06.11.2025

Anil Kumar ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate and
Mr. Manish Boora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 read with Section 439(2) of Cr.P.C., has been filed for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2 by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar in case FIR No.0199 dated 12.09.2025, registered under Section 108 of BNS, at Police Station Bass, Hansi, Haryana.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner is the son of deceased Satpal Singh, who committed suicide on 12.09.2025 due to sustained mental harassment and threats by respondent No.2 (daughter in law of deceased) and her family. It is further contended that the deceased left behind a suicide note clearly naming respondent No.2 and her relatives as responsible for his death. In this regard, the present FIR was lodged. However, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar has allowed the



CRM-M-61906-2025 (O&M) (2)

anticipatory bail to respondent No.2 vide order dated 26.09.2025 and 08.10.2025. Respondent No.2 is specifically named in the suicide note, hence, learned counsel prays for cancellation of the said bail order.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana, assisted by ASI Dharambir puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State and contended that the dispute between the parties is matrimonial discord as deceased was father-in-law of respondent No.2 and petitioner, who seek cancellation of bail is husband of respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 is not required for any custodial interrogation or recovery purposes as she has already joined the investigation.
5. Heard.
6. Impugned order dated 26.09.2025 and 08.10.2025 perused. Keeping in view the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as contention of learned State counsel that as the dispute is between the parties arising out of a matrimonial discord as respondent No.2 is wife of petitioner. Respondent No.2 is not required for any investigation purpose and she has already joined the investigation, this Court finds no merit in the present petition, hence, the same stands dismissed.

06.11.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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