



CRM-M-25341-2026 (O&M) 1

214

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-25341-2026
Date of Decision:27.05.2026**

Ved Parkash

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present:- Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Gaur, AAG, Haryana.

NEERJA K. KALSON J.(Oral)

1 The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS (corresponding to Section 439 of Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.29 dated 08.03.2026 under Sections 316(2)/85 of BNS, 2023 (Corresponding to Sections 406, 498-A of IPC) registered at Police Station Khui Khera, District Fazilka.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is 59 years of age and has been in judicial custody since 05.04.2026. It is contended that the petitioner, being the father-in-law of the complainant/respondent, has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no concern whatsoever with the matrimonial disputes between the complainant and her husband. Learned counsel further submits that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are vague, omnibus, and devoid of any specific allegations or independent corroboration qua the present

**CRM-M-25341-2026 (O&M) 2**

petitioner. It is further argued that neither were any dowry articles ever demanded by the petitioner nor were any such articles ever entrusted to him. Learned counsel additionally contends that the allegations pertaining to harassment, maltreatment, and physical assault are wholly false and baseless, particularly in view of the fact that no Medico Legal Injury Report (MLR) or any other medical evidence has been placed on record to substantiate the allegations regarding the alleged beatings. Attention of this Court has also been drawn to the unexplained delay in the registration of the FIR, which, according to learned counsel, casts a serious doubt upon the veracity of the prosecution story. Learned counsel further submits that the dispute between the parties emanates from matrimonial discord and that there still exists a reasonable possibility of an amicable settlement through mediation proceedings. It is contended that the petitioner, being the father-in-law of the complainant/respondent, is a necessary party to the mediation proceedings and his participation would be essential for the effective and meaningful resolution of the dispute between the parties. In the aforesaid circumstances, it is argued that no useful purpose would be served by continued incarceration of the petitioner and that his custodial interrogation is neither warranted nor justified.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made in the present petition and submits that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature and, therefore, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone


CRM-M-25341-2026 (O&M) 3

through the record as well.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the case of either of the parties before the learned Trial Court, but taking into consideration the fact that it is a matrimonial dispute, the petitioner who is father-in-law of the complainant has not been attributed the allegations of maltreatment and physical assault, coupled with the fact that the petitioner is 59 years of age, he has been in custody since 05.04.2026, the conclusion of trial will take sufficiently long time, the case is triable by the Court of Magistrate and considering the fact that the veracity of the allegations with regard to entrustment of buffalo to the accused will be tested during the course of the trial, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bar any further, therefore the present petition is hereby allowed.

6. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, if not required in any other case, subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Nothing observed here-in-above shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed independently in accordance with law.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

27.05.2026
SN/shweta

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