



CRM-M-32266-2026

1

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

216

CRM-M-32266-2026

Decided on :03.07.2026

Sita Ram

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Dr. Jaiveer Singh Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 22 dated 02.02.2024, under Sections 306, 34 of IPC (Section 34 of IPC is not mentioned in impugned order inadvertently), registered at Police Station Siwani, District Bhiwani.

2. Succinctly, facts of the present case are that the FIR in the present case has been lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Parmod Kumar. It is alleged that on 18.01.2024, name of his younger brother Salender has been mentioned in the gang rape case lodged by Rajbala and her maternal uncle, namely, Ramesh in Siwani Police Station.

It was further alleged that due to the fear of this false case, complainant's brother committed suicide by consuming some poisonous medicines. Thus, request was made to take legal action against accused



CRM-M-32266-2026

2

Rajbala, her mother Darshana, her father Sitaram (petitioner herein), her grandfather Manphool, her maternal grandfather Ramesh, and her uncle Bajrang for naming brother of the complainant in a false case. Thus, present FIR was registered. Petitioner was arrested on 13.07.2025. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, bail was declined vide order dated 29.04.2026.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present cases on the basis of alleged suicide note left by Salender (deceased). He submits that from the bare reading of the allegations made in the suicide note, no offence under Section 306 IPC read with Section 107 IPC i.e. of instigation to commit suicide is made out. He further relies upon the judgments titled as '**Abhinav Mohan Delkar Vs. State of Maharashtra and others**', '**Ude Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana**', '**Jai Bhagwan Vs. State of Haryana**' (CRM-M-57905-2025). To buttress his arguments, he contends that petitioner is in custody for a period of more than 11 months and have no criminal antecedents. He further submits that co-accused namely, Bajrang and Darshna Devi have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the co-ordinate bench of this Court vide order dated 17.03.2026. Moreover, the material witnesses have already been examined. Thus, prays for grant of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, opposes the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that



the suicide note was sent to the FSL for comparison of the hand-writing and it has been established from the report that the suicide note recovered was written by the deceased himself. He further submits that petitioner is specifically alleged to have instigated the deceased to commit suicide. He submits that that out of total 23 prosecution witnesses, 17 witnesses stand examined.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that petitioner is implicated in the present case on the basis of an alleged suicide note. It is also not in dispute that the co-accused, namely, Bajrang and Darshna Devi, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 17.03.2026. Whether the offence under Section 306 IPC read with Section 107 IPC is made out or not would lie within the domain of the trial Court upon appreciation of the evidence led in the light of the settled legal position. This Court, while dealing with the present bail petition, refrains from commenting on the merits of the case. Moreover petitioner has undergone incarceration for a period of about 11 months and 19 days as on 01.07.2026 and has no criminal antecedents.

6. The trial of the cases will take sufficiently long time. However, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

**CRM-M-32266-2026****4**

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

03.07.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No