
(2025) 12 P&H CK 1164

Punjab And Haryana HC

Case No: Criminal Miscellaneous No. 65885 Of 2025(O&M)

Sunil Kumar

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Haryana

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 26, 2025

Acts Referred:

- Indian Penal Code, 1860-Section 34, 304B, 306, 323, 498A
- Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023-Section 528

Hon'ble Judges: Shalini Singh Nagpal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Suvir Sidhu, Kanica Sachdeva

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 101 dated 08.07.2025, under Sections 323, 498-A, 306 and 34 Indian Penal Code, Police Station Behal, District Bhiwani. Section 304-B IPC was added in the FIR during investigation. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. The case was registered on complaint of Madan Lal son of Net Ram who stated that he solemnized marriage of his grand-daughter Pooja with Sunil Kumar R/o Ward No.14, Barwa (133), Bhiwani and spent approximately Rs.22 lacs on dowry, beyond his financial capacity. Within two months of the marriage, Poojas husband Sunil started taunting and harassing her for bringing insufficient dowry and raised demand for new Maruti Swift Car. Her mother-in-law Indrawati, father-in-law Satbir and sister-in-law Rinku also harassed her, raised demand of jewellery and cash of Rs.5 lacs. Deceased Pooja was harassed and beaten in connection with dowry demands. The harassment continued and accused Krishan also misbehaved with her. When Pooja delivered a child, she was further taunted and assaulted and thrown out of the matrimonial home on 18.03.2024 with her minor daughter

without her Ishtridhan. It was further alleged that distressed by the persistent cruelty, on 22.03.2024, she committed suicide by hanging herself in her parental home.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused namely Satbir Singh-father of the petitioner had since been enlarged on anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 13.10.2025. It was a clear case of malicious prosecution of the petitioner and his family members. In March, 2024, deceased Pooja returned to her parental home, where she committed suicide on 22.03.2024. In the first instance, father of deceased, in the presence of other family members stated to the police on 23.03.2024 that his daughter committed suicide as she was mentally disturbed and no one was to blame. On that basis, GD No.13 dated 23.03.2024 was recorded. Even during the inquest proceedings, version of father and brother of the deceased was identical. In fact, deceased left the matrimonial home with her brother in order to accompany her family to Salasar temple and her family borrowed car of the petitioner to visit the temple. The first complaint against petitioner and his other family members was Deputy Superintendent of Police, Siwani. No FIR was, however, registered even after inquiry. Thereafter, eight other complaints were made on the same set of allegations to various authorities and the matter was investigated by Superintendent of Police, Bhiwani/Superintendent of Police, Rohtak/ Deputy Superintendent of Police, Siwani/Deputy Superintendent of Police, Loharu/ Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kalanaur, for as may as nine times. Every time, the allegations levelled in the complaints were not found substantiated, therefore, no case was registered. It is claimed that custody of the minor child was with son of the petitioner and after one year and eight months of commission of suicide, police registered the false FIR despite nine previous inquiry reports exonerating the petitioner and his family members. Learned counsel further argues that the alleged suicide note submitted by the complainant was never produced by him in the first six inquiries and it was produced for the first time in a petition under Section 528 Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, filed by complainant-Madan Lal. Referring to the compromise (Annexure P-6), it was submitted that the expenses incurred on the marriage i.e. Rs.15,00,000/- had been paid to the complainant side and custody of the minor child was given to the family of petitioner. It is argued that registration of the FIR was actuated by greed and was an attempt of extort money from the petitioner and his family members. The real dispute between the parties related to custody of two year old minor daughter of the petitioner. Now, the matter had been amicably resolved. Adoption deed had been executed in favour of brother of the deceased and the child was given in adoption. Petitioner who had clean antecedents was ready and willing to join investigation.

4. Learned State counsel has filed status report and opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail submitting that custodial interrogation of the petitioner was required for complete and effective investigation.

5. Petitioner is the husband of the deceased who died within few days of leaving the matrimonial home. His role is not at par with co-accused Satbir Singh, who has since been enlarged on anticipatory bail. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessitated to unearth all circumstances leading to commission of suicide by deceased. Grant of anticipatory bail at this stage may adversely affect the process of investigation. As such the prayer for anticipatory bail is declined.

6. Dismissed.