



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215+313

CRM-M-68600-2025(O&M);
CRM-M-67941-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.12.2025

1. CRM-M-68600-2025(O&M)

Naseeb ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent

2. CRM-M-67941-2025 (O&M)

Mandeep ...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Pankaj Nanhera, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Rahul Gautam and Mr. Aman Mehta, Advocates,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-68600-2025)

Mr. Sumit Singh Chahal, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-67941-2025)

Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Akash Vashisth, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Both these petitions, filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioners (in
CRM-M-68600-2025 & CRM-M-67941-2025) arising out of the same case
bearing FIR No.88 dated 20.03.2025 registered under Sections 108, (Section
306 of IPC), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station
Sector-40 Gurugram, Haryana are being decided by a common order.

2. For the facility of reference, brief facts are however being
referred to from CRM-M-68600-2025 titled *Naseeb Vs. State of Haryana.*'

3. As per the prosecution version, on 20.03.2025, a telephonic
message was received at Police Station Sector-40, Gurugram from Artemis
Hospital informing that one Manoj Kumar, son of Rajendra Singh, resident

of village Ramalwas, District Charkhi Dadri and presently residing at House No. 1303, Basement, Sector-45, Gurugram, had been brought to the hospital in a “brought dead” condition. On receipt of this information, SI Rohtash, accompanied by ASI Sanjay (No. 2489/FBD) and Constable Sandeep (No. 3190/GGM), proceeded to Artemis Hospital in a government vehicle. They collected the rukka and MLR No. 428 dated 20.03.2025 pertaining to the deceased. At the hospital, Dr. Judith Mattakkal Jose handed over to the police a handwritten suicide note authored by the deceased, along with a sanction letter for a MUDRA Loan & MSME dated 24.02.2025. Both documents were taken into police possession and uploaded on E-Sakshya. The deceased’s wife, Jyoti Yadav, was present at the hospital but was not fit to give any statement at that time. The police thereafter completed the necessary formalities under Section 194 BNSS and shifted the body to the mortuary of the Civil Hospital, Gurugram. A Crime Team was subsequently called to inspect the place of occurrence. During the inspection, the police recovered a chunni (scarf) found in two pieces, one tied to a ceiling hook (lenter) and the other lying on the floor. Another cloth-noose was recovered from inside the wardrobe, along with a notebook titled Mahadev Finance. All items were seized vide separate memos. Thereafter, Jyoti Yadav submitted a written complaint to the Station House Officer, Sector-40, Gurugram, stating that she was an advocate at Gurugram Courts and resided with her husband in a rented premises. She stated that her husband had been under visible stress for some time and although she repeatedly inquired, he did not disclose the cause of his distress. She noticed, however, that he would receive frequent phone calls from certain persons and would become visibly disturbed thereafter. On 20.03.2025, at around

4:00 p.m., while returning home from court, she received a call from Faiyaz, a tailor at a boutique, informing her that her husband had hanged himself. Upon reaching home, she found him hanging from a hook near the ceiling fan in their bedroom. She immediately dialed 112, pursuant to which the police arrived, took down the body and shifted him to Artemis Hospital. According to the complainant, a suicide note was recovered from the deceased's pocket at the hospital, wherein he named several individuals namely Mandeep, Naseeb, Maurya, Vicky Solanki, Vishal Sheoran, and others as persons who had allegedly been harassing him and had driven him to end his life.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contend that as per the case of the prosecution and the allegation in the suicide note the allegations levelled against the petitioner(s) are extracted as under:-

“2. Vishal Sheoran, aka Vikki, from whom I had taken 3 lakh Rupees, I have paid him more than 6 lakh rupees in regard to said amount. After this payment of the amount, Vishal Sheoran and Naseeb started troubling me on the phone and demanded 7 lakh rupees more. On various occasions, I made them understand that the amount with interest of 10% that they are demanding has already been paid by me. Again, they started threatening me and my family that they will deposit the cheque given to them for 3 lakh rupees, which has been received by me. They ask for the said amount with a 5000 rupee penalty daily. They call me on my WhatsApp and threaten me to repay the amount. Vishal Sheoran-9306966436 and Naseeb-9896102054.

xxxxx

9. A lot of wrong has been done to me. Strict action should be taken against (Maurya Committee), Vishal Sheoran, Nasib, Mandeep Jindand Vicki Solanki. These people have cheated me by taking my cheques and making transactions in the name of committees, have taken an interest of 10% from me and want to take more.

215+313 CRM-M-68600-2025(O&M)
CRM-M-67941-2025 (O&M)

And they come to the group, give me threats, show pistols and make a video while sitting with me and threaten me to say in the video that only I demand money from them and they do not demand any money to them.....

xxxxx

12. I have given Rs. 7 lakhs more to Maurya. Action be taken against him. This is on my WhatsApp record. I have given Rs. 4 lakhs to Mandeep Jind. Vikky Solanki keeps on threatening me and strict action be taken against him. Vishal Sheoran and Nasib have also done wrong with me, they cheated me.....”

3. Referring to the above, counsel for the petitioner(s) submit that the allegations are primarily levelled against Maurya Bajaj to whom concession of interim bail has already been granted by this Court vide order dated 19.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-53704-2025 titled as ‘*Maurya Bajaj Vs. State of Haryana*’. Counsel further submits that the petitioners have been in custody since 20.08.2025 and 21.08.2025, respectively and that the investigation in the present case now stands concluded. It is also contended that no recovery of any nature whatsoever remains to be effected from the petitioners. With respect to the allegation that the petitioners had threatened the deceased into making videos under coercion, it is argued that the Investigating Agency has not been able to corroborate the same by placing any material on record. It is also submitted that the chargesheet was filed on 16.10.2025 and that the trial is yet to commence, as no prosecution evidence has been examined till date.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the facts noticed above.

5. Counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, submits that it was due to the sustained and persistent harassment meted out by the petitioners that the deceased, Manoj Kumar, was driven to commit suicide. He contends that the suicide note contains a detailed account of the manner in which the deceased was being harassed. He, however, does not dispute that co-accused

215+313 CRM-M-68600-2025(O&M)
CRM-M-67941-2025 (O&M)

the trial has yet to commence. It is also not in dispute that the petitioners have no other criminal antecedents and that, at best, the allegations relate to a monetary dispute between the parties.

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended along with the present petitions.

7. Without going into the merits and taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioners, their clean antecedents, the nature of the allegations, the stage of the trial and the fact that co-accused Maurya Bajaj has been granted the concession of interim bail, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petitions.

8. The instant petition is ***allowed*** and the petitioners (in CRM-M-68600-2025 & CRM-M-67941-2025) are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

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

10.12.2025
Sumit Gusain

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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