



\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **BAIL APPLN. 4759/2025**

RAHUL KHATRI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vimal Tyagi, Mr. Balaji Pathak,
Mr. Tripurari Jha, Mr. Akshay
Rathee, Advocates.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for
State.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

26.02.2026

%

1. By way of the present application, the applicant is seeking grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR bearing no. 364/2024, registered at Police Station Pul Prahladpur, Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 80/85/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereafter '*BNS*').

2. The brief facts of the case are that the marriage between the applicant and Khusboo (deceased) was solemnised on 18.02.2024. It is alleged that on 29.11.2024, the applicant, along with his mother and sister, had left the house at about 9:00 a.m. At around 9:30 p.m. on the same day, the mother and sister of the applicant had returned home and found the deceased hanging by her neck. Thereafter, the deceased was taken to the hospital by



the mother and sister of the applicant, where she was declared brought dead. As per the post-mortem report, the cause of death was opined as “*asphyxia due to ante-mortem hanging.*” Further, on the statement of the father of the deceased alleging that the deceased was being harassed for not bringing a car as dowry and that such harassment compelled her to take her own life, the present FIR came to be registered.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant argues that the applicant has been in judicial custody since 30.11.2024. It is argued that the father of the deceased has already been examined before the learned Trial Court and has deposed that a sum of ₹5 lakhs was given to his daughter at the time of marriage with his own free will, and that there was no demand of dowry from the side of the applicant at the time of marriage. It is contended that the applicant never demanded a car and that the deceased took the extreme step on account of her suspicion regarding an alleged illicit relationship of the applicant with another person. It is further argued that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude and, therefore, the applicant deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, the learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the bail application. It is argued that within a period of nine months of the marriage, the victim committed suicide at her matrimonial home due to continuous harassment on account of demands for a car from her parental family. It is further argued that PW-1, the father of the deceased, has supported the prosecution case and has categorically deposed that the applicant was persistently harassing the deceased to bring a car. He has also denied the defence version that the victim took the extreme step due to the applicant’s alleged illicit relationship with another family member. It is further argued



that the mother of the deceased is yet to be examined and, therefore, at this stage, there exists a likelihood of the applicant influencing or intimidating material witnesses. Accordingly, it is prayed that the applicant may not be enlarged on regular bail.

5. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State, and has perused the material on record.

6. In the present case, this Court notes that the marriage between the applicant and the deceased was solemnised on 18.02.2024, and the unfortunate incident took place on 29.11.2024. Thus, within a period of nine months of the marriage, the deceased took the extreme step of ending her life.

7. It is to be noted that the allegations against the applicant are that he had subjected the deceased to harassment on account of demand for dowry and specifically, the demand for a car, which allegedly had compelled the deceased to take such a step. Clearly, in the present case, the presumption under Section 118 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 stands attracted, as there are specific allegations of dowry-related harassment, which have been duly corroborated by the statement of PW-1, who has stated that the deceased was being harassed on account of dowry demands, and on the account of deceased committing suicide within a period of about nine months from the date of marriage.

8. This Court also notes that the father of the deceased, PW-1, has been examined before the learned Trial Court and has deposed that he had given a sum of ₹5 lakh to his daughter at the time of marriage towards household articles and furniture. He further stated that no demand for a car was made



by the applicant at the time of marriage; *however*, soon after the marriage, the applicant/accused began harassing the deceased by demanding a car. PW-1 has further deposed that the applicant had initially called him and informed him that the deceased had fallen from the stairs and sustained injuries, and some time thereafter, had informed him that she had hanged herself. The relevant portion of his statement recorded before the Trial Court reads as follows:

“...After marriage, my daughter started complaining about accused Rahul, his mother Rani and her nanad Rakhi. They used to harass her to bring a car. I tried to talk with the accused persons regarding their demand of car but they were not ready to talk to me. Whenever we received a call from our daughter, she always made complaint of her harassment by the accused persons...”

9. Further, it is pertinent to note that the examination-in-chief of the mother of the deceased has already been conducted; however, her cross-examination is pending. In her examination-in-chief, the deceased’s mother has also supported the case of the prosecution and has deposed that within 15–20 days of the marriage, when the deceased had visited her parental home, she had informed that she was being taunted for having brought insufficient dowry.

10. Therefore, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, particularly that the allegations against the applicant are grave in nature and that cross-examination of the mother of the deceased is yet to be conducted, this Court finds no ground to grant regular bail to the applicant at this stage.

11. Accordingly, the present bail application stands dismissed.

12. It is, however, clarified that nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.



13. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 26, 2026/vc

RB