



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

CRM-M-26106-2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 13.05.2026

Pronounced on: 18.05.2026

Uploaded on: 18.05.2026

Mandeep Sangwan

...Petitioner

V/S

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Parvinder, Advocate,
Ms. Harmanpreet Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. Vikas Singh Chawra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharati, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate and
Mr. Manik Makkar, Advocate for the complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.112 dated 15.05.2025, under Section 80 of BNS, Police Station Civil Lines, Bhiwani. This is the first petition seeking regular bail.

2. Case was registered on complaint of Anita who stated that she was residing with her husband Satbir and son Pankaj in Omaxe New Chandigarh. Her daughter Priya was married on 22.07.2019 in Chandigarh. It was a love marriage. After about two years of marriage, her son-in-law repeatedly asked her daughter to bring money from her home. Several times, on the asking of her daughter, she had given money to her son-in-law Mandeep son of

Bhagat Singh through Google Pay on her daughter's mobile phone. Many a times, she had given money in cash, yet, the demands kept increasing. In last April, her son-in-law called them home and demanded Rs.80 lacs or else take back their daughter. They tried to convince him many a time but the unreasonable demands continued. He kept pressurising her daughter for money. The day before, on 14.05.2025, at about 12 noon, her daughter spoke to her normally. At about 4:45 PM, her son-in-law telephonically called her and informed that Priya was not talking. She and her son Pankaj along with daughter-in-law Prerna all reached Bhiwani and found her daughter dead. There were ligature marks on her neck. Her son-in-law Mandeep son of Bhagat Singh had killed Priya by pressurising her for money.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was in custody for the last six months. Six, out of 25 witnesses had been examined, including all material witnesses. There was no question of any demand of dowry as it was a love marriage performed after the deceased eloped with the petitioner. The death occurred six years after marriage. Deceased had been investing heavily in stock market, she committed suicide when she suffered heavy losses in the business. For her business, she had been borrowing money from various relatives. Petitioner too, on several occasions, had given her money. In this context, he referred to whatsapp conversations on record. It was urged that there was no complaint of any kind ever

moved before any authority. It was the petitioner who had taken the deceased to the hospital and also informed her parents. Petitioner had clean antecedents and in the facts and circumstances of the case, he deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel assisted by counsel for the complainant has strongly opposed the prayer for regular bail relying upon '***Yogendra Pal Singh v. Raghvendra Singh alias Prince and Another***', ***2025 SCC OnLine SC 2580***, to contend that there were specific allegations against the petitioner regarding demand of Rs.80 lacs from parents of the deceased. The gravity and nature of the allegations did not entitle the petitioner for bail.

5. Petitioner is the sole accused, husband of the deceased, who has been booked for causing dowry death of his wife within 7 years of marriage. There are specific allegations that he had been demanding Rs.80 lacs from parents of the deceased. 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.”*

6. Considering the seriousness and gravity of the alleged crime, the *prima facie* material against the petitioner, the severity of punishment in the event of conviction, coupled with the presumption under Section 118 of Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 (BSA), the prayer for regular bail is **declined**.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

Reserved on: 13.05.2026
Pronounced on: 18.05.2026
Kapil

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