



CRM-M-25612-2026 (O&M)

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

212

CRM-M-25612-2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 12.05.2026

Pronounced on: 14.05.2026

Uploaded on: 15.05.2026

BRIJESH ALIAS TONI**PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

Argued by: Mr. S.K. Garg Narwana, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Vishal Garg Narwana, Advocate,
Mr. Nitin Sachdeva, Advocate and
Mr. Shubham Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, AAG Haryana.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.68 dated 19.02.2025 under Sections 80 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023, Police Station Ganaur, District Sonipat. Section 3(5) BNS has been deleted from the FIR during investigation. This is the first petition for regular bail.

2. Complainant Sunil Kumar reported that his daughter Annu aged 28 was married with Brijesh s/o Raj Singh on 10.02.2023 as per Hindu rites and customs. In the marriage, he had given dowry more than his capacity. His daughter was D.Pharma and was studying further. Since the day of marriage, her husband and family members were not happy with the dowry and harassed her for bringing more. Though, he fulfilled their demands, yet said persons did not mend their ways and he brought his daughter to his house in November, 2024. After that, on the assurance of uncle of Brijesh, she was sent back in December, 2024, but the harassment did not end. On 19.02.2025, she



CRM-M-25612-2026 (O&M)

informed the complainant over the phone that her husband was harassing her very much for bringing money, disrobed her and turned her out of the room, whereupon she covered her body with a blanket. She complained to the parents of Brijesh and her younger sister-in-law, but they too supported Brijesh. Complainant tried to pacify Annu and to prevail over her. He stated that his daughter was harassed by her husband Brijesh, mother-in-law, father-in-law and sister-in-laws for bringing less dowry. On 19.02.2025, they were informed that his daughter had died upon which they reached the house of his daughter, where she was found hanging from the ceiling fan of the room with a red coloured cloth. She committed suicide, fed up with the harassment by her husband Brijesh, mother-in-law Bala Devi, father-in-law Raj Singh, elder sister-in-law Renu and younger sister-in-law. Legal action was prayed for.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was in custody for the last 01 year and 02 months. Marriage of the petitioner was solemnized on 10.02.2023. There was no suicide note left behind by the deceased. In fact, deceased was happily living in the matrimonial home as could be seen from the numerous photographs appended on record. No date, time or other particulars of the harassment were mentioned in the FIR, nor any specific role was attributed to the petitioner. Deceased was never subjected to cruelty or harassment. Rather, she had long telephonic conversation with her mother on the day of incident, whereafter, she made a call to the petitioner informing him that her mother was forcing her to return to the parental home. Deceased committed suicide on account of the pressure exerted by her mother to abandon her family and return to her parents. Petitioner was highly educated, who completed his B.Tech from Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak and was working as a Constable in Delhi Police. He had a post-



CRM-M-25612-2026 (O&M)

graduate degree in political science in the year, 2021 and was preparing for UPSC examination. Mother of the deceased forced her not to have physical relations with the petitioner and get rid of him. She also got her 13 weeks pregnancy aborted at the parental house. Deceased was continuously pressurized and forced through repeated telephonic conversations to return to the parental home. Petitioner, who had clear antecedents, thus deserved to be released on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail submitting that death of the bride occurred within two years of marriage and petitioner being the main accused did not deserve the concession of bail, in view of the specific allegations against him.

5. In ***Yogendra Pal Singh Vs. Raghvendra Singh (2025) SCC Online SC 2580***, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under:

*“21. In **Shabeen Ahmad Vs. State of U.P. (2025) 4 SCC 172**, 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....*

*.....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 (2018) 10 SCC 443**, 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.”*



CRM-M-25612-2026 (O&M)

6. Petitioner is the husband, the main accused booked by the police for causing dowry death of his wife in two years of marriage. The allegations are grave. Considering the nature and substance of accusations, the role attributed to the petitioner, the quantum of punishment conviction may entail, the statutory presumption under Section 118 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam (BSA), 2023 and all attendant facts and circumstances of the case as also the fact that prosecution witnesses are yet to be recorded, it is not a fit case to release the petitioner on bail. The petition, accordingly, stands dismissed.

7. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

14.05.2026
HS.CHAUHAN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No