

2026:PHHC:074617



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

101

CRM-M-26684-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.05.2026

Harish Sharma

...Petitioner

V/S

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Mukesh Kumar Bhatnagar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Nandini Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J.

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of
FIR No.0011 dated 05.02.2026, under Sections 316(2) and 85 BNS,
Women Police Station, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.
This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner
was husband of the deceased. His marriage with the
complainant/deceased was solemnized on 18.04.2024. No child was
born out of the wedlock. Before marriage, petitioner had been giving
money to the deceased and her father for making arrangements and
there was no question of demand of dowry. Complainant lived in the
matrimonial home only for 3-4 months in the year 2024. Petitioner



was an Army man, after marriage he went to Kargil to join duty on 23.05.2024. Complainant/deceased was mostly living in her parental home and petitioner had nothing to do with the offence. A false complaint was lodged against the petitioner and his family members. A petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 was instituted by the petitioner on 22.01.2025 which he had later withdrawn to file a divorce petition. Deceased committed suicide while living in the parental home. Petitioner had clean antecedents and was willing to join investigation, therefore, he deserved to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail, submitting that FIR was registered on 05.02.2026 initially under Section 406, 498-A IPC on complaint of the deceased, who was harassed, tortured for dowry and was body shamed. On the day of incident, she came to attend the court proceedings on 21.02.2026 and went to the matrimonial home from where she was thrown out, whereafter she committed suicide in the parental home. He submits that the investigating agency had recovered a video recorded by the deceased before her death claiming that she was committing suicide on account of ill-treatment by the petitioner and his family members.



Considering the serious nature of allegations, petitioners did not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Petitioner is the husband of the deceased. As per allegations, after the marriage on 18.04.2024, despite sufficient amount spent in the marriage and dowry articles given, deceased was harassed in connection with dowry demands and treated with cruelty. It has come in investigation that on the day of incident, deceased came to the matrimonial home from where she was again thrown out. Considering the nature and substance of allegations against the petitioner, who is the main accused, alleged to have caused her dowry death, it is not a fit case to exercise discretion under Section 482 BNSS. There are no extraordinary circumstances to release him on anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

12.05.2026
Kapil

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