



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

Date of decision: 10.03.2026

CRM-M-53704-2025

MAURYA BAJAJPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CRM-M-73320-2025

JYOTI YADAVPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHERRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. S.S.Swaich, Advocate with
Ms. Ishani Goyal, Advocate,
Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. Jaswinder Singh Swaich, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-53704-2025.

Ms. Tapan Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-73320-2025 and complainant
in CRM-M-53704-2025.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Both these petitions are being decided by a common order. While the petitioner-Maurya Bajaj in CRM-M-53704-2025 seeks anticipatory bail, the petitioner-Jyoti Yadav in CRM-M-73320-2025 seeks cancellation of the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 19.11.2025.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered of the statement of Jyoti Yadav widow of Manoj Kumar, the same reads thus:-

“I Jyoti Yadav W/o Sh. Manoj Kumar am resident of Ramalwass, District Charkhi Dadri and at present living on rent at House No. 1303 Basement Sector 45 Gurugram and working as an advocate at Gurugram Court. My husband Manoj Kumar seemed to be under tension for quite some time. I also tried to know from my husband the reason of his being under tension, but my husband did not tell me the reason of his tension, but for quite some time many people were making repeated phone calls to my husband Manoj. Whenever my husband received a phone call he would become tense and used to be upset (ghabraya ghabraya). Today on 20.3.25 at about 4 I was coming to my house from Gurgaon Court. At that time I got a phone call from tailor Faiyaz working with me in Boutique and he told that Manoj Bhaiya has hanged himself (Manoj Bhaiya ne phansi laga li hai). I immediately rushed to my house and saw that my husband had hanged himself from the Lanter hook in the roof near the fan in his bedroom. On seeing him I immediately made a phone call on 112. The police came there and pulled him down. Thereafter, they took him to Artemis Hospital, where a Suicide Note was found from the pocket of my husband. He had mentioned the names of persons harassing him, their names are Mandeep, Nasir, Morya, Vicky Solanki, Vishal Sheoran and others also included. My husband has

committed suicide by hanging himself due to harassment by them. All the said names have been written by my husband in his Suicide Note and all the said persons were demanding money, as has been mentioned in the Suicide Note all these things. The legal action be taken against the said persons. I shall be highly thankful to you. All these persons are responsible for the death of my husband. The aforesaid accused have compelled my husband to commit suicide by making illegal demand of money and threatening him.”

3. The matter came up for hearing on 19.11.2025 and after noticing the contention of the petitioner(s), the following order was passed :-

“Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner inter alia contends that as per the status report filed by the respondent itself, the deceased Manoj Kumar had committed suicide after levelling allegations against various persons including the petitioner. The substratum of the allegations levelled against the petitioner was to the effect that the petitioner had been partnering with the deceased in a Committee/Chit Fund Business in which certain payments were claimed by the petitioner from the deceased-Manoj Kumar. It was averred that as against the overdue amount of Rs.3,00,000/- he had already paid a sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- and that petitioner was still demanding a sum of Rs.3,25,000/-.

*Counsel for the petitioner further contends that under similar circumstances, the Hon'ble Supreme Court quashed the FIR pertaining to abetment of suicide in the matter of "**Mohit Singhal & Anr. Vs. The State of Uttarakhand & Ors. reported as 2024 (1) RCR (Criminal) 72**". In the said case, the allegations were much graver as compared to the instant case since the accused had not only used abusive language against the deceased therein but had also assaulted him by a belt. The said circumstances were held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to not constitute the ingredients of abetment of*

suicide. He submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and that even otherwise, there is no recovery to be effected from the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called for and to extend all cooperation to the Investigating Agency.

Learned State Counsel as well as counsel for the complainant vehemently argue that there were 05 accused who had been named by the deceased in his suicide note out of which 04 of the accused already stand arrested. They contend that since the petitioner was specifically named in the suicide note, hence, the concession of anticipatory bail ought not to be granted.

*It is however not the case that anticipatory bail of any of the accused was dismissed by the High Court, hence, merely because other accused were arrested does not mean that the petitioner would not have a right to submit an application for seeking concession of anticipatory bail. Further, they are currently not in a situation to respond to the judgment in the matter of **"Mohit Singhal & Anr. Vs. The State of Uttarakhand & Ors.(supra)"**.*

List on 10.03.2026.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when so required by the Investigating Agency. In the event of the petitioner joining the investigation, he shall be admitted to interim bail by the arresting officer/investigating officer on his furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/investigating officer. The petitioner(s) shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) of 2023.

4. On resumed hearing, Counsel for the respondent-State contends that the petitioner has already joined investigation and is no longer required

by the Police for any interrogation or investigation. Counsel for the respondent-complainant however contends that the petitioner has been threatening the witnesses and that he has not given the complete translation of the suicide note wherein the deceased had also mentioned that the accused persons have his blank signed cheques and that the same are being retained by them. He contends that the said cheques are still required to be recovered.

5. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the suicide note was translated and extracted in its entirety. He contends that the page, which is now being relied upon by the respondent-complainant, is a subsequent additional page, which is not signed by the deceased and that the verification of the said page of it is having been written by the deceased, is yet to be done. Besides, in earlier 12 paragraphs of the suicide note, the deceased has nowhere mentioned that any person is in possession of his blank signed cheques. No such cheque has also been presented for encashment. He further submits that the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***“Mohit Singhal and another versus the State of Uttarakhand and others”*** reported as ***2024 (1) RCR (Criminal) 72*** would nonetheless be applicable to the present case and the basic ingredients for offence of abetment of suicide being made out would still be debatable. It is submitted that once the investigating agency has specifically made a statement that the petitioner has joined investigation and no recovery is to be effected from him and there is no allegation levelled by the Investigating Agency of any abuse of concession extended to the petitioner, there is no reason as to why the concession of bail already extended in favour of the petitioner vide order dated 19.11.2025, be not confirmed.

6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

7. Before proceeding further into the matter, it would be apposite to make a reference to the statutory provision under Section 108 of the BNS. The same reads thus:-

“108. Abetment of suicide.—If any person commits suicide, whoever abets the commission of such suicide, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine.”

8. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in the judgment of “***Mohit Singhal and Another v. State of Uttarakhand and Others***” held that where a person commits suicide due to a loan transaction or the alleged maltreatment due to the demand for repayment or a dispute arising with respect thereto, such action undertaken by the creditor cannot be perceived as an act amounting to abetment of suicide. The Supreme Court held that an act of instigation must be of such intensity as its intended to push deceased to such position under which he or she has no choice but to commit suicide and should be in close proximity to committing suicide. The perusal of the suicide note shows that there is only a description of monetary dispute *inter se* between the parties but *prima facie* it is yet to be ascertained whether the petitioner had in any manner abetted the commission of suicide by the respondent. Besides, the Investigating Agency has itself submitted before this Court that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary for completion of the investigation in the present case.

9. Under the given circumstance, the interim order dated 19.11.2025 is made absolute in CRM-M-53704-2025 and same is allowed while the petition filed by Jyoti Yadav bearing CRM-M-73320-2025 seeking cancellation of bail is dismissed.

MARCH 10, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

:

Yes/No