



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

111

CRM-M-68633-2025(O&M)

Date of decision: 25.02.2026

Saurabh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Jangjit Singh Dahiya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Armaan Dahiya, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-8827-2026

Allowed, as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Accordingly, copy of Annexures P-16 to P-21 are taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

Main case

The present first petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.97 dated 27.09.2025 registered under Sections 108 & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station GRP Panipat, District Ambala.

2. Briefly summarized the facts of the present case are that an information was received at Police Station GRPF, Panipat, that a dead body was lying on the railway track. Upon receiving the information, the Investigating Officer reached the spot. During the personal search of the deceased, an Aadhaar card in the name of Nafe Singh, a two-page suicide

note, and other documents were recovered. A mobile number written on one of the papers was contacted, and the relatives of the deceased were informed. Subsequently, Smt. Krishna Devi, wife of the deceased, made a complaint stating that she had two daughters and one son, all married. Her son was residing in New Zealand with his family. Her husband, Nafe Singh, aged 75 years, was a retired Army personnel. They had purchased two shops in front of the Railway Station in the street of Dr. Sukhvinder, which were registered in her name. In 2022, the shops were rented out to Dharam Singh, an advocate. Since then, Dharam Singh and his sons, Sourabh and Sandeep, allegedly harassed them and failed to pay the rent. When asked to vacate the shops, they allegedly threatened to falsely implicate her husband in criminal cases and pressurized him to transfer the shops in Dharam Singh's name. She further alleged that Dharam Singh and his sons assaulted her husband and tore her clothes, regarding which she lodged a complaint at Police Station Madlauda. Despite a panchayat settlement in which Rs. 1.70 lakh was paid, the accused did not vacate the shops and continued to harass and threaten them over phone calls. Due to the alleged harassment and torture by Dharam Singh and his sons, her husband committed suicide by coming under a train. On the basis of her complaint, the present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner had been in possession of shop of the complainant since the year 2022 but had taken the same for keeping his goods and belongings. He further contends that as a matter of fact, the petitioner was known to the deceased as son of the deceased is putting up in New Zealand and the father of the petitioner was desirous to send the petitioner abroad i.e. to New

Zealand. Accordingly, a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- was given in the year 2023. However, when Nafe Singh and his son Sonu did not send the petitioner abroad, hence, his father started demanding his money back. As a counter-blast, a complaint was submitted by the complainant against the family of the petitioner. A compromise was effected in the police station on 18.09.2025 wherein it is specifically recorded that a sum of Rs.70,000/- was paid by the complainant to the father of the petitioner and the shops were vacated. He further contends that Nafe Singh later committed suicide. The petitioner thus cannot be held to have instigated the commission of suicide. A vehement reliance is placed by the petitioner on the criminal antecedents of deceased-Nafe Singh including FIR No.344 dated 06.09.2019 that has been registered under Sections 186, 332, 353, 427 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Matlauda for which he and his wife were facing trial. Another FIR No.249 dated 13.08.1997 had been registered under Section 13A of the Public Gambling Act, 1867 at Police Station Matlauda, Panipat as well. He submits that there are also inter se disputes within the family of the deceased, hence, the real cause of committing suicide could be any of the numerous disputes which the deceased was facing.

4. Learned State Counsel as well as counsel for the complainant however, contend that if the case of the petitioner is to be taken at the face value, he himself claims that two shops of the deceased had been taken over by him in the year 2022. Not a single rent receipt or licence or fee pertaining to the usage of the said shop has ever been produced. There is also no written agreement or note that has been produced by the petitioner about

delivery of possession of the shop. It is further contended that an argument was advanced that the complainant had taken over possession of the shops since money was not being paid, however, the claim of the petitioner himself is to the effect that a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- had been transferred in November, 2023. The fact that they had taken possession of the shop in the year 2022 thus counters his argument. There was thus no occasion for the petitioner to have taken possession of the shop of the complainant in anticipation of the failure to return the money which was yet to be paid and a transaction which was yet to be entered into. It is further contended that the money transferred by the complainant was infact an extortion money paid by them to get their shops vacated from the petitioner as well as his father, who had been extending numerous threats to them to either sell the property to them at their own terms and conditions, failing which it shall never be got vacated through the process of law. It was under such economic duress that they agreed to pay money to the petitioner and his father for vacation of the shop. They further contend that even after the payment, the petitioner as well as his father threatened the complainant again and as a result of continued harassment, the deceased-Nafe Singh committed suicide. They further contend that a suicide note has been recovered wherein there are specific allegations against the petitioner as well as his father Dharam Singh. It is submitted that the attribution and allegations against the petitioner are only building up castles in the air without any substantive proof. None of the allegations levelled by the petitioner i.e. either of having paid any money to the deceased at any point in time for sending the petitioner abroad or of delivery of possession of the shop have been corroborated by any

documentary evidence or any monetary transaction to establish payment of money and/or having paid any rent.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. An event of suicide is not just a standalone event. A protracted harassment over a period of time itself may amount to instigation to commit suicide. The petitioner has also raised mutually contradictory pleas about the circumstances in which he came in possession of the shops i.e. as a tenant or as a licensee. He has not been able to produce any written agreement of rent, permission to occupy or of payment of any rent etc. There is also no documentary evidence of any assurance sent to the petitioner or payment for the same. Proposing multiple probabilities it discredits the claim of the petitioner, since, after the deceased, the petitioner is the only other informant of the true nature of the dispute.

7. Being the best person to know the dispute, the petitioner was required to reasonably explain the true events and the circumstances preceding the suicide, at the time of seeking anticipatory bail. The petitioner, on the other hand, is offering probabilities for which a person may commit suicide. It thus seems that the matter shall require a deeper probe and for the same, a custodial interrogation is required. The issues raised during arguments, are to be determined at the stage of trial. It remains undisputed that the deceased had left a suicide note specifically levelling allegations against the petitioner herein. This Court has no reasons to brush aside the allegations levelled in the suicide note at this stage. The multiple arguments culling out stories of numerous possibilities in which the deceased may have

committed suicide, cannot be accepted by this Court at this stage to disregard the version written by the deceased himself in his suicide note. The theories of the probability and defence put up by the counsel for the petitioner are to be tested during the trial. The allegations are *prima facie* serious in nature. Taking into consideration the antecedents and the manner in which the operations have been undertaken, the possibility of the petitioner threatening the other witnesses also cannot be ruled out at this stage.

7. Consequently, finding no grounds for extending anticipatory bail, the present petition is *dismissed*.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

25.02.2026

Sumit Gusain

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