



CRM-M-64724-2024

-1-

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

223

CRM-M-64724-2024

Date of Decision: 22.09.2025

RAVINDER MACHRA@ MANU

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Grover, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.
Mr. Pardeep Solath, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 207 dated 24.05.2019 for the offences under Sections 302,120-B, 201 IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station, Azad Nagar, Hisar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that a complaint was lodged by the complainant Dalip Singh alleging that his daughter Suman was married to one Parmod Machra in June, 2003 and at the time of marriage, a sufficient dowry along with a plot of land was given to his daughter. The daughter of the complainant was residing in the same locality where the complainant. On 18.06.2006, the nephew of the complainant, namely Suresh, was married to Urmila. The nephew of the complainant-Suresh had earlier been residing with the complainant being his brother's son. It is alleged that Parmod Machra developed illicit relations with Urmila, wife of Suresh, and on that account started harassing Suman. It is further the allegation of the prosecution that the



present petitioner, who is the real brother of Parmod Machra, supplied a poisonous substance to Parmod, which was subsequently administered to Suman resulting her death. It is further the case of the prosecution that the petitioner along with the co-accused hatched a conspiracy to cause the death of Suman.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the FIR in question was lodged after an unexplained delay of more than five months from the date of the alleged occurrence. It is further argued that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case only being the brother of the husband of deceased. He further submits that although the trial Court referred to the voice transcriptions played in the open Court but the same were reported inaudible.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner played an active role in the murder of the deceased. It is further submitted that the evidence against the petitioner includes audio transcripts annexed with the case file, which purportedly implicates his involvement in committing the death of Suman. The State counsel has also produced the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court today, which has been taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner has been in custody for a period of 1 year, 6 months, and 24 days.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.



6. A bare perusal of the audio transcripts reveals that the present petitioner was actively involved not only in the death of the deceased but also in the subsequent cover-up. During the course of proceedings, it has been revealed that Forensic Science Laboratory report(Annexure R-1) clearly indicates that voice samples of all three accused being probable matching. For reference, the relevant of the FSL report is reproduced herein:

LABORATORY EXAMINATION

“The utterance stated to be spoken by speakers Ravinder, Pramod and Urmila (petitioner) are marked Q1(A), Q1(B) and Q1(C) were segregated from CD-R marked exhibit-Q1.

On the basis of auditory and spectrographic examination of questioned voice sample marked Q1(A), Q1(B) and Q1 (C) with the specimen voice samples of Ravinder, Pramod and Urmila marked S1 (A), S2(B) and S3(C) using multi speech software. It is has been observed that voice marked Q1(A), Q1(B) and Q1(C) are the probable voice of same person ie. Ravinder, Pramod and Urmila whose specimen voice are marked S1(A) (Ravinder), S2(B) (Pramod) and S3(C) (Urmila) respectively in respect of available 'acoustic' and other 'linguistic & phonetic' features."

7. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

22.09.2025
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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