



CRM-M-58762-2025 (O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

204

CRM-M-58762-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 13.02.2026

POOJA DEVI

PETITIONER

VERSUS

UT OF CHANDIGARH AND ANOTHER

RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Dilpreet Singh Gandhi, Advocate
Mr. Jashan Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Addl. P.P. U.T., Chandigarh

None for respondent No.2.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No.54 dated 23.06.2025 under Section 80 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023, Police Station North, Chandigarh, District Chandigarh. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. On 13.11.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Apprehending their arrest, the petitioner(s) have filed the instant petition(s) under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.54 dated 23.06.2025 registered under Section 80 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station North, Chandigarh.

2. Present FIR was registered against the petitioners on the complaint of Shri Ram Verma (father of deceased Poonam) stating therein that he had four children. On 28.4.2024, he performed the marriage of his second daughter Poonam with co-accused-Ajay as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. Ajay used to do a private work at Chandigarh. He along with his parents was residing in servant quarter of Kothi No.305, Sector 10, Chandigarh. After marriage, his daughter

**CRM-M-58762-2025 (O&M)**

stayed with her husband-Ajay and his family members. She used to inform him on telephone that her husband and his family members were not happy with the dowry given in the marriage. They used to taunt her and used to pressurize her for bringing more dowry. On 21.6.2025, in the morning a telephonic conversation took place between complainant and deceased-Poonam wherein she explicitly informed him that the accused persons were subjecting her to harassment and she also requested her father i.e. complainant to take her back from her matrimonial home otherwise she will come by train to ensure her safety. At about 11.30 AM, she wrote a suicide note and sent the same to his elder daughter-Vandana via Whatsapp, who resides at Partapgarh. In her suicide note, deceased-Poonam specifically and unequivocally held her in-laws responsible for her death and specifically stated that her in-laws have tortured her and forced her to commit suicide.

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submitted that the petitioner(s), who are sisters-in-law of the deceased, are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. He submitted that in the FIR there are no specific allegations either of harassment or instigation/abetment against the petitioners. He further submitted that allegations levelled against the petitioners are vague and general in nature and they have been nominated merely being members of the in-laws' family of the deceased and no offence under Section 80 of the BNS, 2023 is made out against the petitioners. He further submitted that the deceased/victim was having some illicit and extra-marital relationship with one person of her parental village and discovery of this fact led to frequent quarrels and serious matrimonial discord between the deceased and her husband i.e. brother of the petitioners, and the said fact was also in the knowledge of family of deceased and to resolve this dispute even several Panchayats were also convened between both the families. He further submitted that the petitioner (Aarti) is residing separately since 16.05.2023 in her matrimonial home at Ranveer Nagar, District Amethi, Uttar Pradesh (approximately at a distance of nearly 2000 kms) and currently engaged in pursuing her academic qualifications through various courses in State of Uttar Pradesh. As such, she remains considerably occupied with both her personal and academic obligations and thus the petitioner has no role to play in the alleged offence. He further*

**CRM-M-58762-2025 (O&M)**

submitted that the petitioners are not involved in any other case and are ready and willing to join the investigation.

4. *Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the ground that there are specific allegations levelled against the petitioners by the deceased in her suicide note.*

5. *I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.*

6. *Admittedly, the present FIR got lodged by the complainant (father of the deceased) alleging that her daughter was subjected to torture and harassment by her in-laws, including the petitioner(s), who are sisters-in-law of the deceased and in a whatsapp message sent by the deceased-victim to her elder sister-Vandana, she has stated that her 'mother-in-law', 'father-in-law', both 'sisters-in-law' (present petitioners) and 'husband' have tortured her and forced her to commit suicide, however, what was the specific role and involvement of each and every person, especially the present petitioner(s), in perpetration of the crime and harassing the deceased-victim, has nowhere been detailed i.e. either in the suicide note or in the complaint lodged by the father of the deceased, which prima facie poses certain doubts in the case set up by the prosecution, especially against the present petitioner(s), who are sisters-in-law of the deceased-victim.*

7. *Although, the marriage between petitioners' brother - Ajay and deceased was solemnized on 28.04.2024 and the daughter of the complainant has committed suicide due to alleged harassment within 14 months of the marriage, however, the allegations levelled against the petitioner(s) appears to be non-specific and imprecise in nature, since no specific incident or fact qua raising demand of dowry and harassment has been detailed either by complainant (father of the deceased) in the complaint or by the deceased/victim herself in the suicide note sent to her sister on whatsapp.*

In view of the peculiar facts and circumstances involved in the present case and non-availability of any cogent material or evidence on record, prima facie there appears to be no actual role and involvement on the part of the petitioner(s) in perpetration of the crime and connecting them to the chain of events leading to the death of daughter of the complainant, so the assertion of petitioner(s) that they have been implicated for just being the members of in-laws'

**CRM-M-58762-2025 (O&M)**

family is quite tenable. Moreover, the weightage of the fact that petitioner-Aarti, who is a married lady and was residing at a distant place of 2000 kms at District Amethi, Uttar Pradesh, since 16.05.2023 and was not present at the matrimonial home of the deceased at the time of the incident, cannot be over-looked, at this stage, while considering her application for pre-arrest bail and even allegations against petitioner-Pooja Devi, who though was unmarried at the time of alleged incident and was residing with her parents in the matrimonial home of the deceased/victim, are also not specific and are on the same lines, as have been attributed to the petitioner-Aarti, which in toto are not sufficient to construe and disclose any instigation or abetment on the part of the petitioner(s) and to subject the deceased-victim to commit suicide after alleged harassment and torture.

8. *Since, allegations levelled in the FIR and the suicide note against petitioner(s) are not specific, so as to construe any fact qua raising 'demand of dowry' and 'harassment to the deceased-victim' and even the same are not precise enough to determine the actual role and involvement of the petitioner(s) in perpetration of the crime by way of 'torturing the deceased-victim' and 'abetment to commit suicide' and, moreover, the authenticity and correctness of the suicide note is a matter of trial, which need thorough corroboration supported by cogent evidence during trial and, therefore, prima-facie custodial interrogation of both the petitioner(s) is not required, at this stage.*

9. *Adjourned to 13.02.2026*

10. *In the meanwhile, arrest of both the petitioners - Aarti and Pooja Devi shall remain stayed and they are directed to join investigation on or before 10.12.2025 and in the event of their arrest, they shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer subject to the condition that they shall join the investigation and co-operate with the investigating agency and shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.*

11. *Photocopy of this order be placed on the record of connected case file."*



CRM-M-58762-2025 (O&M)

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Jatinder Singh concedes that petitioner had joined investigation, however, he opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.
4. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, as enumerated above, but without commenting on merits, order dated 13.11.2025, granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made absolute, subject to conditions laid down in Section 482(2) Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.
5. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

13.02.2026
HS.CHAUHAN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No