



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

CRM-M-16652-2026 (O&M)
Reserved on: 25.05.2026
Pronounced on: 27.05.2026
Uploaded on: 27.05.2026

SANDEEP GORIYA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Shalini Singh Nagpal

Argued by: Mr. Aman Pal, Sr. Advocate
with Ms. Neha Rani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 386 dated 23.10.2023 under Sections 304-B, 406, 498-A, 506 Indian Penal Code, Police Station Urban Estate, District Rohtak. This is the second petition for regular bail. First one was dismissed as withdrawn on 20.01.2025.
2. Complainant, mother of victim stated that her daughter Sukriti was married to Sandeep on 17.10.2022 as per Hindu rites and customs. They had given dowry as per their capacity in the marriage. Her husband expired the next day of her daughter's marriage. Shortly after the marriage, her daughter's husband Sandeep, father-in-law Satbir, mother-in-law Usha, brother-in-law Mandeep and sister-in-law Ritika stated harassing her for bringing less dowry and raised demands for car, diamond set and jewellery etc. She and her son Bhavneesh visited her daughter's home, once in December 2022 and again in 2023, where her family members assured that they would behave property with her daughter and would not raise demands



in future. Yet, the beating and mental torture continued. Her daughter delivered a son on 15.08.2023. When she was pregnant, she was beaten up and mentally tortured. Prior to her delivery, she was beaten up by Sandeep and on the day of delivery, Sandeep pushed her to the ground, after which the doctor disclosed that the child had a spine problem. She was tortured by Sandeep, brother-in-law Mandeep and sister-in-law Ritika, besides the parents-in-law. The brother-in-law and sister-in-law said that the child would never recover and his treatment would cost at least ₹50 lacs. From that time onwards, Sandeep started torturing her daughter and told her either to kill the child or to go and die. He told her that he did not have ₹50,00,000/- for treatment of his son as he had to pay installments of the flat, purchased in Gurugram, worth ₹1,00,000/-. She was told to bring ₹50,00,000/-, if she wanted to keep the child alive. She came to Rotahk 10 days ago. On 23.10.2023, at 12.30 noon, Sandeep came to their residence and started quarreling with her daughter. At that time, Bhavneesh was also at home. After abusing him, he took her daughter in the car. After some time, her daughter called Bhavneesh and informed that Sandeep had pushed her from the car and made her fall. After some time, her daughter reached on foot followed by Sandeep who started torturing and abusing her saying that she either kill the boy or die or take divorce. On account of the torture, her daughter was so depressed that she went upstairs to her room and closed the door saying that she was going to die. Yet, Sandeep ran away and while leaving, threatened her. At about 3.50 PM, Bhavneesh knocked the door but when he got no response, he broke open the door. He saw her daughter hanging with the *Dupatta* from the fan. She was immediately brought down and taken to PGIMS Rohtak, where she was declared brought dead. Her



daughter died due to pressure, fear and harassment from her in-laws. Legal action was prayed for.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that investigation of the case was complete. Charges were framed, but none out of the 23 witnesses was examined. 04 other family members of the petitioner, arraigned as accused were exonerated by the Investigating Agency. Deceased wife of the petitioner committed suicide in her parental home, 10 days after leaving matrimonial home. Her child was suffering from a genetic disorder, on which account she remained depressed, which led her to take the extreme step. Prior to the registration of FIR, there was no previous complaint of any kind moved to any authority regarding the alleged demands for dowry. The marriage was a simple one, without dowry as the wife's father was on death bed. The FIR did not allege any demand soon before the death. No Panchayat was ever convened with regard to the alleged harassment. On two occasions, petitioner had been allowed interim bail in connection with treatment of his minor child, who was being looked after by his family members. He had never misused the concession and surrendered well in time. Petitioner had clean antecedents. Considering the period of custody i.e. 02 years 05 months and 09 days, petitioner deserved to be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of affidavit of Jitesh Malhotra, H.P.S. Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rohtak and opposed the prayer for regular bail submitting that death of Sukriti occurred after 01 year and 06 days of marriage. Though the suicide happened in the parental home, petitioner visited the deceased, in her parental home, just



before suicide. There were specific allegations of demand of car and beatings to the deceased during pregnancy. Demand of Rs. 50,00,000/- was raised after birth of the child, who required specialized treatment for his ailment. As per DIATEC report, deceased was on video call with the petitioner, while she hanged herself. Given the serious and grave nature of allegations, against the petitioner, he was not entitled to be released on regular bail.

5. Death of Sukriti by suicide has occurred after 01 year 06 days of the marriage. There are specific and serious allegations against the petitioner with regard to demands of car, diamond set, jewellery items after marriage and ₹50,00,000/- for treatment of the child. Just before the suicide, petitioner visited house of the deceased and took her in the car. It is alleged that deceased was pushed out of the car and made to fall and the petitioner tortured and abused her. Presumption under Section 113-B of Indian Evidence Act is attracted in the case.

6. In ***‘Yogendra Pal Singh v. Raghvendra Singh alias Prince and Another, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 2580***, Hon’ble Supreme Court observed as under:-

“21. In Shabeen Ahmad v. State of U.P.29, this Court cautioned that the grant of bail in dowry death cases, despite strong incriminating material, undermines public confidence in the justice delivery system. The Court observed that in cases of dowry death, courts must remain alive to the broader societal ramifications, as such offences strike at the very root of social justice and gender equality. Permitting alleged prime perpetrators of such heinous crimes to remain at liberty on bail, when evidence indicates active infliction of physical as



well as mental cruelty, may not only jeopardize the fairness of the trial but also erode public faith in the administration of criminal justice.

22. xxxx xxxx xxxx

23. *Dowry death is not merely an offence against an individual but a crime against society at large. As emphasized in Social Action Forum for Manav Adhikar v. Union of India, the alarming rise in such cases necessitates strict judicial scrutiny. Permitting the accused to remain at large in the face of such material would erode the deterrent object of Sections 304B and 498A IPC.”*

7. The fact that the 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 would be sufficient for enlarging the petitioner on bail when the gravity of the offence alleged is severe. These were the observations of the Apex Court in ***Kalyan Chandra Sarkar Vs. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav*** 2004(2) RCR (Criminal) 254.

8. Considering the nature of accusation, severity of punishment and *prima facie* satisfaction of the Court in support of the charge, no case for release on bail is made out. Accordingly, the application for regular bail is dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an opinion on merits of the case.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

27.05.2026

Ajay Goswami

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No