

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:055498



208

CRM-M-17236 of 2026(O&M)

Reserved on: 07.04.2026

Pronounced on:09.04.2026

Uploaded on:09.04.2026

Vishal

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Ms.Tanu Priya Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, AAG Haryana.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No. 413 dated 30.11.2023, under Sections 304-B and 34 IPC (Section 80 and 3(5) BNS), Police Station Chhapar, District Yamuna Nagar. This is the second petition for regular bail. First petition for regular bail was dismissed 18.11.2025.

Complainant Vinod father of the deceased informed the police that his daughter Ishika was married with Vishal son of Rajesh Kumar in December 2020. From the marriage, she had a son Shivans. For one and a half years, Ishika was kept well but thereafter, her in-laws started harassing her for bringing less dowry. For sometime, she did not tell them about the harassment but later when the harassment increased, she informed them. He and his brother Om Parkash went to her in-laws house to prevail over them and they agreed to keep his daughter well. On 12.05.2023, his daughter and her husband Vishal along with other in-laws went to attend a marriage ceremony in village Kakedi district Kaithal, in a borrowed Creta car. When

they were returning, the car met with an accident near Pehowa and occupants of the car had a narrow escape. The car was badly damaged. Thereafter, his son-in-law started harassing his daughter to bring money from her father to compensate for the damage caused to the car. His daughter was repeatedly harassed by son-in-law Vishal, mother-in-law Usha, father-in-law Rajesh Kumar and brother-in-law Rohan for bring less dowry and for not compensating for the damage to the car. The in-laws also sold away her gold jewellery which he had given in dowry. When his daughter informed him, his son brought her to the parental house on 15.11.2023. On 28.11.2023, his son-in-law took her back forcibly. On 29.11.2023 at around 2.30 PM, his daughter's father-in-law Rajesh made a video call to him informing that Ishika was suffering from pain abdomen. They left for village Jagadhauli to see Ishika. On the way, they received a call from Vishal informing that Ishika had died. He alleged that due to the harassment and repeated demands for dowry and money, fed up with the taunts, his daughter ended her life by consuming poison.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was behind bars for the last more than two years. All material witnesses had been examined in the case. Trial was not progressing in meaningful manner. There was neither any prior complaint regarding harassment in connection with dowry nor any allegation that soon before her death, petitioner subjected the deceased to cruelty in connection with dowry demands. Minor child of the petitioner was being looked after by his family and was suffering in the absence of his parents. Petitioner, therefore, deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that after dismissal of the first bail application on 18.11.2025 there was no change in the circumstance on which account, the petition could be allowed.

Vide order dated 18.11.2025, first application for regular bail of the petitioner was declined observing as under:

'Marriage of petitioner and deceased Ishika was solemnized in December 2020. Petitioner has been booked for causing dowry death of his wife within one and half years of marriage. He is alleged to have harassed and tortured the deceased for bringing insufficient dowry and for not compensating for damage to vehicle involved in an accident caused by him. The nature and gravity of allegations against the petitioner, the role attributed to him, quantum of sentence conviction may entail and all relevant facts and circumstances of the case do not entitle the petitioner to regular bail despite the period of incarceration undergone by him. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the petition stands dismissed.'

After dismissal of the first application on 18.11.2025, there is no substantial change in the circumstance to justify grant of regular bail in the second application. Gravity and seriousness of allegations remains the same and custody of another 4 months cannot be regarded as a change in circumstance, substantial enough to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Dismissed.

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

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

09.04.2026

reema

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No