

2026:PHHC:022311



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.65297 of 2025

Jasmer Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	09.02.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	13.02.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	13.02.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Yagsimant Attri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Suresh Nain, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under

2026:PHHC:022311



Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
725	03.08.2025	Panipat City, District Panipat	108 and 308 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of complaint submitted by the complainant Parveen Kumar alleging that the relations between his father-in-law Karan and his brother Dalel were strained due to which altercations used to take place between them. On 03.08.2025, his father-in-law informed his brother-in-law Vikrant that Jyoti daughter of Dalel had borrowed a sum of Rs.20 lakhs from Karan and had not been returning the same. On raising demand of money, the family members of Dalel including the petitioner who is a friend of co-accused Jyoti, made him consume some intoxicant, prepared an objectionable video and on the basis of the same, they had been blackmailing him from the past two years. They had also been raising demand of Rs.50 lakhs in cash. He alleged that due to stress, his father-in-law had committed suicide on that very day. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panipat on 19.08.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has

2026:PHHC:022311



been falsely implicated in this case. There is no material whatsoever on record to connect the petitioner with the allegations so levelled. No complaint had been filed by the deceased with regard to his being blackmailed by the co-accused and himself. The ingredients for commission of subject offences are not attracted qua him. He is ready to join investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the deceased had left a suicide note wherein specific allegations were levelled by the victim against the petitioner as well and the same establish that due to harassment meted out at the hands of the petitioner and other accused, the victim had ended his life. The allegations make out a case for commission of subject offences against the petitioner. His custodial interrogation is must for conducting thorough investigation in the matter. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have abetted suicide by the victim. In order to bring a case within the purview of Section 108 of BNS, undoubtedly, there must be a case of suicide and in the commission of the said offence, a person who is said to have abetted the commission of suicide,

2026:PHHC:022311



must have played an active role by act of instigation and doing certain acts to facilitate the commission of suicide. Allegations of harassment of the deceased by the accused do not suffice. In the absence of any positive action on the part of the accused proximate to the time of occurrence which led to suicide, offence under Section 108 of BNS would not be considered to have been committed. In the instant case, the name of petitioner had been mentioned in the suicide note left by the victim. However, it is only on thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial that any conclusion as to the factum of instigation or abetment on the part of the petitioner to the victim to commit suicide can be drawn and not at this stage. Given the nature of the allegations and the circumstances peculiar to this case, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. Pre trial incarceration should not be a replica of post conviction sentencing. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be extended benefit of bail in the event of his arrest, subject to his surrendering before the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer within a period of ten days from the date of passing of this order and shall join investigation and on his surrender within that period, he shall be released on bail by the Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer on furnishing personal/surety bonds to its satisfaction and subject to the following conditions:-

(i) the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall

2026:PHHC:022311



appear before the Investigating officer/Arresting officer as and when required.

(ii) He shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

(iii) He shall not commit any similar offence while on bail.

(iv) He shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

(iv) He shall deposit his passport if any, with the jurisdictional Magistrate/trial Court.

7. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.02.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No