

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:048814



CRM-M-5028 of 2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 24.03.2026

Pronounced on: 30.03.2026

Uploaded on: 30.03.2026

Harish

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Abhishek Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Kanica Sachdeva, DAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No. 59 dated 17.04.2023, under Sections 304-B, 498-A, 34 IPC (Section 302 IPC added lateron), Police Station Bhupani, Faridabad. This is the first petition for regular bail.

The FIR lodged on complaint by Neeraj brother of deceased records that marriage of deceased Lalita @ Mithlesh was solemnised with Harish son of Paramand on 10.02.2022 as per Hindu Rituals. Dowry was given by her father Ashok Kumar and mother Paravati as per their capacity. After the wedding the bride went to the house of her husband. Her husband and his parents Paramand and Shyamwati began harassing Lalita for dowry. They used to thrash her and throw her out of the house demanding Rs. 5 lakh in cash. Due to the harassment on 17.04.2023, they murdered Lalita @ Mithlesh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was the husband of the deceased. He was behind bars for almost three years. Allegations against him were vague, general and unspecific. Out of 16, only 3 witnesses were examined and trial was likely to take long to conclude. The parents-in-law has since been enlarged on regular bail, therefore, petitioner too deserved bail on account of prolonged incarceration.

Learned State counsel has filed status report along with custody certificate. He opposes the prayer for bail submitting that deceased hanged herself on 17.04.2023 on account of the harassment by the petitioner in connection with dowry demands and in case of release on bail, petitioner may tamper with evidence and influence the material witnesses.

Petitioner, husband of deceased Lalita, has been booked for causing her dowry death within 1-1/2 years of marriage. Allegations against the petitioner are grave. The fact that petitioner has undergone certain period of incarceration, by itself, would not entitle him to bail, nor the fact that the trial is not likely to conclude in near future either by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration would be sufficient for enlarging the petitioner on bail when the gravity of offence alleged is severe/serious. These were the observation of the Apex Court in ***Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Versus Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav 2004(2) RCR (Criminal) 254***. Petitioner, the husband, who was the primary caretaker of the wife and her welfare, cannot claim for parity with parents-in-law who have since been allowed regular bail.

Considering the nature of accusation, relationship of the petitioner with the deceased and *prima-facie* satisfaction of the Court in

support of the charge , no case for release on bail is made out.

Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand
disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

30.03.2026

reema
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No