

2025:PHHC:102273



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

Sr. No.221

CRM-M-57007-2024 (O&amp;M)

Date of decision : 6.8.2025

**Rahul Verma**

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

**State of Punjab**

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH**

Present: Mr. Gulzar Mohammed, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Through VC.

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)**

The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS, 2023) has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0027 dated 13.3.2023, under Sections 306/34 IPC (Sections 304-B & 498-A IPC were added later on), registered at Police Station Bhargo Camp Jalandhar.

2. The translated version of the FIR is reproduced below:-

*“Statement of a person Mohan Singh Tomar S/O Gyan Singh Tomar tenant at house of Satinder Aswal, Mohall Preet Nagar, PS Raiwal tehsil Risikesh, District Dehradun State Uttra Khand. M No. 78955117431 stated that I am resident of above mentioned address aged about 50 years. I am running auto. I have 2 sons and 3 daughters. My daughter xxx whose age is 23 years and is matric pass, who performed love marriage with Rahul Verma S/O Sehdev Verma H No. 78 Aman Nagar model House Jalandhar on dated 13.09.2022 at Risikesh Dehradun Uttra Khand. She started residing with her husband above Rahul Verma with in laws family at Jalandhar on the above mentioned address. My daughter xxx and her husband Rahul Verma running saloon separately. Our daughter never came to us. She uses to convey everything on my mobile to me.*

2025:PHHC:102273



*She many a time told to us on phone that her husband Rahul Verma and her father in law Sehdev Verma s/O Assa Ram are maltreating, abusing and giving beatings to her and used say to go to her parents as they do not want to keep her, demanding money. About these facts our daughter uses to tell us on phone. On the intervening night of 11/12-03.2023 at about 1 AM my daughter xxx told us about beating given to her on phone then we said to her that they will visit her in 2 days and will sort out the matter. She said that Rahul is demanding divorce. We make our daughter to understand that they will certainly visit to her at Jalandhar. Yesterday on dated 12,03.2023 at time about 9 morning Rahul told to my son Mohit Singh Tomar on phone No. 9997305609 that xxx is lying on bed and is not talking, to whom my son said to get her to talk with him but not allowed to talk but again at 12.30 PM Rahul on mobile phone of my son told that xxx has committed suicide by hanging herself with ceiling fan. So today I along with my family and respectable reached at Bhargo camp police station. My daughter Xxx was being maltreated by her husband Rahul Verma and father in law Sehdev Verma on account of money and she committed suicide due to fed-up with this and we also suspect that she has been murdered then hanged with fan. Strict investigation be conducted and justice be imparted to us and legal action be taken against them. SD/-“*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case on the statement of the complainant-father of the deceased. It is submitted that the petitioner and the deceased had solemnized love marriage on 13.9.2022, and were leading a happy and stable life. Both being working, they were financially also very sound, and thus the allegation of demand for dowry is far-fetched. Infact, no such complaint was ever made against the petitioner or his family members during the life time of the deceased. Further, there is no evidence on record, including any call details data showing record of call between the petitioner and the family members of the deceased, which indicates towards the complicity of the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner has already

2025:PHHC:102273



undergone an actual custody of 02 years, 04 months and 21 days and is not involved in any other criminal case. It is also highlighted that the father of the petitioner has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 10.9.2024 passed in CRM-M-16261-2024 titled as *Sehdev Verma Vs. State of Punjab*.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. She, while relying upon the contents of the status report dated 11.5.2025 filed by way of an affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, West Jalandhar on behalf the State, submits that the daughter of the complainant passed away on 12.3.2023, i.e. within a period of six months of her marriage with the petitioner, which was solemnized on 13.9.2022. Specific allegations of subjecting the deceased to harassment and cruelty, mental as well as physical, particularly for the demand of dowry, have been leveled by the complainant against the petitioner. The postmortem examination of the deceased was got conducted at Civil Hospital, Jalandhar, as per which ligature marks were found present around the neck of the deceased. The viscera of the deceased was also sent for chemical examination. After the receipt of the chemical examination report dated 10.7.2023 was received, as per which no poison was detected in exhibits I, II, III, IV & V, opinion of medical officer was obtained with respect to cause of death, who opined that death of the deceased was asphyxia due to hanging, which is antemortem in nature, and sufficient to cause death in an ordinary course of life. Therefore, in view of the serious allegations against the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

2025:PHHC:102273



5. Learned State counsel has filed custody certificate which is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 02 years, 04 months and 21 days and there is no other case registered against him. She, on instructions from ASI-Lakhvir Singh submits that charges were framed on 12.12.2023 and out of a total of 21 prosecution witnesses, 10 stand examined.

6. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. At this juncture, a reference can be made to the observations of the Delhi High Court made in ***Kuldeep Singh vs. The State Govt. of NCT of Delhi, BAIL APPLN. 159/2025 & CRL.M.A. 1040/2025***, which through varying qua the factual aspect, are relevant in all cases where a life is lost due to the alleged harassment and cruelty, particularly due to demand for dowry. The Court, while dismissing the regular bail of a husband in an FIR under sections 302/304B/498A/34 of the Indian Penal Code, showcased remorse over the occurrence of such offences, by expressing thus:

*“16. While deciding bail applications in such cases, the Constitutional Courts bear in mind the intent behind enactment of provisions of law, especially such as Section 304B of IPC. Though this section came to be enacted in the year 1986 and has been in existence for almost 40 years, the Courts time and again are saddened by the cases which come up before them for adjudication, reflecting that woman of this country are still harassed, tortured and killed, merely because they are married to a man, in a family which after the marriage, keeps demanding, as a matter of right due to the matrimonial alliance, money and dowry articles.*

xxx

xxx

xxx

*18. Before concluding, this Court observes that cases of dowry death and murder, like the present one, often reveal a distressing pattern. Families of the victims frequently mention*

2025:PHHC:102273



*in their statements before the Court and the police that their daughters had complained about being tortured and feared for their lives due to unmet dowry demands. However, due to societal pressure and the fear of social stigma, these families often suggest or compel their daughters to continue to try and adjust and live in their matrimonial homes, where they are subsequently killed or driven to suicide.*

*19. Judgments in such cases serve as a medium to highlight to society how young lives can be tragically lost under these circumstances and it may not always be advisable to convey message to the victim of dowry harassment and threats who are visibly beaten and battered by their husbands, that they should continue to endure suffering in their matrimonial homes as it is the “right” thing to do after marriage. This mindset emboldens, and is exploited by, perpetrators including a husband, who kills his wife, exploiting the situation that the victim wife has nowhere else to go, as her parental family is also advising her to live with him despite the torture and physical abuse. In cases such as the present one, granting bail liberally could encourage such practices and offences.”*

8. Though this Court is alive to the fact that a considerate approach pertaining to the liberty of an individual must be taken, however, Courts cannot remain oblivious to the gravity and heinous nature of the offences purported to have been committed by an accused.

9. Reverting to the case in hand, *prima facie* serious allegations of subjecting the deceased to harassment and cruelty, including beatings, for the demand of dowry have been leveled against the petitioner. Though the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of the of 02 years, 04 months and 21 days, taking a lenient approach does not appeal to the consciousness of this Court, given the facts of the case and the gravity of the alleged offence. The life of the deceased was lost in less than 6 months of her marriage to the petitioner, which as per the complainant was purportedly due to the cruelty inflicted upon his daughter. The victim-deceased died in her matrimonial

2025.PHHC:102273



home. Ligature marks were found present around the neck of the deceased, and the cause of death was opined to be asphyxia due to hanging, being antemortem in nature. Out of 21 total prosecution witnesses, only 11 remain to be examined. The material prosecution witnesses who appeared before the trial Court have supported the allegations leveled against the petitioner.

10. In the light of the foregoing discussion, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed. However, the learned trial Court concerned is directed to make an endeavour to conclude the trial expeditiously, preferably, within a period of six months.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(KIRTI SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**6.8.2025**

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether Reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No