



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(143)

CRM-M-64240-2025

Date of Decision: 05.03.2026

JATIN

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. B.R. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yadwinder Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Davinder Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 of BNSS has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 109 dated 20.09.2025 under Section 108 of BNS, registered at Police Station Daba Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. The translated version of the FIR is reproduced below:-

“Stated that I am resident of above said address and works in a private factory. I was married to Rajesh Kumar 27-28 years ago. From this marriage I have four children. My eldest daughter is xxxx aged about 27 years and younger to her is xxxx aged about 22 years, younger to her is my son Gurdeep Singh aged about 18 years and youngest is my son Pardeep Kumar aged about 12 years. My eldest daughter xxxx is married in Uttar Pradesh and she lives there. My daughter xxxx works in a private factory and on 16.09.2025 me, my husband and my both sons had gone to our jobs and my daughter xxxx was alone at home. Then at about 2.30 PM my neighbor Deepak Kumar came to take me from my factory at Vishkarma Nagar, near Vishkarma Mandir, Ludhiana. On



reaching home my neighbors told me that my daughter xxxx has committed suicide by hanging with his veil from the ceiling fan. I with the help of my neighbor took my daughter down, called my husband Rajesh Kumar and by arranging a vehicle took my daughter to DMC Hospital Ludhiana and they referred my daughter to 'Civil Hospital Ludhiana. I took my daughter to Civil Hospital Ludhiana and there she was declared dead by the doctor. Two days before death my daughter had told me that since last three years, she is known to one Jatin Mehra son of Rakesh Kumar resident of Gagan Nagar, PS Daba Ludhiana. And since then, Jatin Mehra used to have relations with me by alluring me to marry me and used to blackmail me by making obscene photos of mine and is now refusing to marry me. I did not disclose the said matter told to me by my daughter in the family so that atmosphere in the family is not disturbed. My daughter xxxx aged about 22 years has committed suicide being harassed by Jatin Mehra. Due to suicide by my daughter xxxx, our family was in trauma so we could not come to record our statement to you. To have recorded statement to you in the presence of my husband Rajesh Kumar, read, heard and is correct, action be taken.sd/- xxxx.'"

3. Status report by way of affidavit of PPS, Assistant commissioner of Police, Industrial Area-B, Ludhiana has been filed by the State, which is taken on record. A copy thereof has been furnished to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the 22-year-old petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the unfortunate incident occurred on 16.09.2025, and a DDR No.11 was registered on 18.09.2025 on the statement of the father of the deceased, who stated that his daughter was under mental stress, and that no one was responsible for her death. However, subsequent statement of the mother of the deceased was recorded on 20.09.2025, wherein she leveled false allegations leading to the registration of the instant FIR. It is submitted that the factum of the consensual relation between the deceased and the petitioner was known to the complainant, who had infact demanded money



from the petitioner, which he refused. There is no incriminating evidence or recovery on record linking the petitioner to any act or omission that caused the deceased's suicide. Reference is made to the judgment of the Supreme Court passed in ***Jayedeeptsinh Pravinsinh Chavda and others vs. State of Gujarat, passed in SLP(Crl.) No.7957 of 2024***, whereby it was held that in order to bring home charges under Section 306 IPC (108 of BNS), there must be intention and active aiding or abetment of the commission of suicide and that mere harassment by itself is not sufficient to hold an accused guilty of abetting suicide, to submit that in the present case also, the ingredients of Section 108 BNS are not made out against the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has clean antecedents and has already undergone an actual custody of 05 months and 07 days.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that there are specific and serious allegations against the petitioner. He states that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence.

6. Learned State counsel submits that during the course of investigation, the spot of the alleged occurrence was inspected, and the statements of witnesses were recorded. While placing reliance on the status report dated 04.03.2026, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner was in fact in a relationship with the deceased for about 03 years, and alleged established physical relations with her on the false pretext of marriage, which he later refused to solemnize. Learned State counsel further submits that the petitioner took obscene photographs of the deceased and used the same to blackmail her. Such act of deceit, exploitation and subsequent refusal to marry allegedly caused severe emotion trauma to the



deceased, and are stated to be the direct and proximate cause which abetted the deceased to commit suicide on 16.09.2025 by hanging herself from the ceiling fan at her house. He submits that in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

7. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

8. *Prima facie*, grave and specific allegations of sexual exploitation on the false pretext of marriage, and subsequent blackmail using obscene photographs, have been levelled against the petitioner. It is the allegation that due to the commission of these alleged acts by the petitioner, the 22 year old daughter of the complainant was left with no other choice but to end her life. Moreover, trial in the instant case is at a nascent stage, since none out of the total prosecution witnesses cited, has been examined. The FSL report of the evidence recovered is awaited. Therefore, under such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

10 Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

March 05, 2026

Ritika

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