



\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1529/2025**

MANJEET SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Maitrayee Dasgupta, Mr.
Abhishek Kukkar and Mr. Kunal
Choudhary, Advocates

versus

STATE OF GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
the State with Ms. Puja Mann,
Advocate and SI Mahendra P.S. V K
South

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

% **29.05.2025**

1. By way of the instant application, the applicant seeks grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing No. 111/2024, registered at Police Station Vasant Kunj, South, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Section 306/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter '*IPC*').
2. Briefly stated, the facts of the present case are that on 18.02.2024, vide DD entry No. 55A, a PCR call had been received at Police Station Vasant Kunj, South, revealing that a person had been found lying in an unconscious state inside a car bearing registration no. HR-08AE-7633, which had been parked near Air Force Station, Rajokari Village Road, Rajokari, New Delhi. Upon inspection of the said car, the dead body of a person, later identified as Pankaj Kumar, had been recovered along with a notebook having a suicide note, and a video of the deceased had also been



recovered, revealing that the deceased had committed suicide as the accused/petitioner herein Manjeet Singh had been torturing and threatening him.

3. The wife of the deceased, namely Seema Devi, alleged that the applicant/accused and his family members wanted to occupy their shop/property situated at Prempuri, Village- Jharsa, Gurugram. On 15.02.2024, the applicant/accused had forcefully dispossessed the family of the deceased from the shop and changed the locks of the premises, which had led to a quarrel between the parties and police complaints had been made from both sides. The wife/complainant further stated that the applicant herein had threatened the deceased that he would not let him live in the locality unless he vacated the premises. On the basis of the aforesaid, the present FIR came to be registered and the investigation commenced, and the applicant, along with his wife, mother and two friends, had been arrested.

4. During investigation, it had been revealed that an agreement to sell the aforesaid property had been executed between the mother of the deceased, namely, Meena and the applicant herein and an amount of Rs.8 lacs had been paid by the accused/applicant herein and Rs.2 lacs had to be paid at the time of registry of the said property. However, the registry of the property had not been executed in time, and a civil suit for specific performance had been filed by the applicant herein. *Vide* order dated 10.08.2022, the concerned Court had directed the mother of the deceased to execute the sale deed.

5. The learned counsel for the applicant argues that the basic ingredients of Section 306 of the IPC are not met in the present case. She states that there had been a civil dispute between the parties, wherein the applicant had



succeeded. She argues that the applicant has been in judicial custody for last one year and the trial will take some time to conclude, and there is nothing on record to reveal that the applicant, immediately prior to the incident in question committed any act which had led to the deceased committing suicide. The learned counsel also states that the applicant has no criminal antecedents, and grounds of arrest had not been provided to the applicant and that the FSL report has failed to reveal the cause of death by consumption of poison. Therefore, it is prayed that the applicant herein be granted regular bail in the present case.

6. On the other hand, learned APP for the State, opposes the present bail application and argues that the suicide note of the victim reveals mental state of the deceased. It is stated that the suicide was committed on 18.02.2024 and the complaint was lodged by deceased on 16.02.2024. It is argued that the suicide note and the video clearly mention and point out the cause and manner of committing suicide. It is also stated that the post-mortem report and the supplementary FSL report point out that no poisonous substance could be detected in the viscera of the deceased, and ethyl alcohol 30 mg/ml had been detected in the viscera of the deceased, however, stated that it will be only during the trial when the Doctor will be examined that it will be clear regarding the discrepancies in the statement as to why the poison could be detected, as some poisons cannot be detected in the bloodstream or otherwise. Therefore, it is prayed that the bail application of the applicant be rejected.

7. This Court has heard arguments addressed on behalf of both sides and has perused the material available on record.



8. In the present case, in the suicide note and video, the deceased had specifically mentioned that he had been compelled to take the extreme step of committing suicide due to the persistent threats and unbearable conduct of the accused/applicant herein. As per the Status Report, the suicide note had been sent to Forensic Sciences Laboratory (FSL) to match with admitted handwriting of the deceased, and the same has matched with the same.

9. However, the post-mortem report, which was given subsequently on 19.02.2024, when second opinion had been sought, opined that "*death is due to poisoning. However, the deceased had consumed alcohol prior to death.*" Since the death is due to poisoning, it is a matter of trial as to why a discrepancy had occurred in the first opinion and the second opinion. However, this Court also notes that admittedly, there was a property dispute between the parties.

10. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and the fact that the trial will take some time to conclude, and also the fact that the applicant is in judicial custody since 20.02.2024, this Court is inclined to grant regular bail to the present accused/applicant on his furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- with one surety bond of the like amount, subject to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court/Successor Court/Link Court/Duty Judge concerned on the following terms & conditions:

- i) The applicant will not absent himself before the learned Trial Court;
- ii) The applicant shall not leave the country without prior permission of the concerned Court.
- iii) The applicant shall not directly or indirectly make an attempt to influence the witnesses or tamper with the evidence in any manner.



iv) In case of change of residential address/contact details, the applicant shall promptly inform the same to the concerned Court.

11. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.
12. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed herein above shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.
13. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

MAY 27, 2025/A

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

Click here to check corrigendum, if any