

2026.PHHC.044092



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-70744-2025

Manish Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	18.03.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	20.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	20.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or 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. Azad Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 403 dated 26.08.2025 registered under Section 107 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNS’) at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a written

2026.PHHC.044092



complaint submitted by the complainant Ranjna alleging therein that she was married and was residing in Zirakpur. Her younger sister Chhaya Kumari had come to stay at her house on 04.07.2025. On 26.08.2025, she had committed suicide by hanging herself by tying a noose to the fan. She had left a suicide note wherein she had mentioned that she was being harassed by the present petitioner and his family members. The complainant as such prayed for taking action against the petitioner by alleging that he was responsible for suicide of her sister. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 31.08.2025. Subsequently, a handwritten diary of the deceased was also produced by the complainant before the police which was taken into possession. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 31.08.2025. He is not required for further investigation. The ingredients for commission of offence under Section 107 of BNS are not attracted as there is nothing on record to suggest that he had abetted suicide by the victim in any manner whatsoever. The allegations do not show any proximate act committed by the petitioner immediately before the suicide of the victim that could be considered to be a cause for the suicide. The victim who was a 17-year-old girl might have taken extreme step due to emotional immaturity. No useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner in custody anymore. His antecedents are clean. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that there are serious

2026.PHHC.044092



allegations against the petitioner. The victim had left a note holding the petitioner responsible for committing suicide by her. The allegations make out a *prima facie* case for commission of subject offence as against the petitioner. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have abetted suicide by the victim. The victim is stated to have left a suicide note, copy of which has been annexed with the status report as Annexure R-3. On perusal of contents of the same, it is revealed that the victim had written that after promising to perform marriage with her and emotionally blackmailing her, the petitioner did not stand by her when the question of her marriage with him came. She alleged that the petitioner had been extending threats to send their photos to her family members. She is shown to have written that despite the fact that she had fought with her own family with regard to the petitioner, he was no longer with her. The allegations *prima facie* shows the complicity of the petitioner in the commission of the subject offence. However, he has now been in custody for a period of more than six months. There are no chances of conclusion of trial in near future as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. The continued detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. It is well settled that pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-

2026.PHHC.044092



conviction sentencing and that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. The object of jail is to secure appearance of the accused during trial, and it cannot be preventive or punitive. Taking into consideration the nature of the subject offences, the period spent by the petitioner in custody and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.
8. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

20th March, 2026
Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned

:

Yes / No
2. Whether reportable

:

Yes / No