



CRM-M-19963-2025

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

CRM-M-19963-2025
Reserved on: 02.05.2025
Pronounced on: 19.05.2025

Meena

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Pradeep Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Gopal Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
484	17.12.2024	Narnaund, District Hisar	108, 3(5) of BNS

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. In paragraph 5 of the bail petition, the accused declares that she has no criminal antecedents.

3. The facts and allegations are taken from reply filed by State counsel, which reads as follows:

“2. That the brief facts of the case are that on 17.12.2024, Police Station Narnaund received information that Jitender son of Ram Kishan had shot himself in his house and thereafter, police party reached at his house where Santosh wife of deceased Jitender disclosed that he had been taken to Hisar. Scene of crime was examined by "Scene of crime" team and a revolver, a live cartridge and used cartridge along with blood strained pillow and tube were taken into police custody from the sport. Thereafter, police official reached at the Sapra Hospital Hisar where Amit son of deceased Jitender got his statement recorded to the effect that he got married to



CRM-M-19963-2025

Meena (Present Petitioner) daughter of Ram Mehar on 18th January 2021 and that they had a son aged 2 years. He alleged that after his marriage, his wife Meena (Present Petitioner) began to unnecessarily harass him and his family members. Several family panchayats were held but Meena (Present Petitioner) never changed her behavior. He stated that he had also filed a divorce case against Meena. He further alleged that Meena (Present Petitioner), Navneet, Rajender, Ram Mehar, Saroj, Jasvir were constantly harassing and threatening him and his family members. On 16.12.2024 at around 10:15 AM, Meena (Present Petitioner) was dropped at their house by some of her family members and she forcibly entered into their house and set in the baithak (Drawing room). At that time, his mother and grandmother were present inside the house. When his father Jitender returned home, she began to fight with him and she threatened him that if she would be taken out of his house, she would get a false case of molestation registered against him. His father told him about the said incident and thereafter, they went to the office of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hansi to move their application. Thereafter, his father went to the house of his grandfather Rajender. His father returned home in the night. On 17.12.2024 at about 6:30 A.M., when his father woke up, Meena (Present Petitioner) was standing outside and hurling abuses at his father and mother. Being extremely hurt, his father shot himself in head with his licensed revolver. He alleged that his father had committed suicide being harassed by Meena, Navneet, Rajender, Ram Mehar, Saroj and Jasvir and he sought legal action against them. On the basis of above statement, police initially registered present FIR No. 484 dated 17.12.2024 under sections 108, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 was registered at Police Station Narnaund.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. Allegations against the petitioner are that there was a matrimonial dispute going on between the son of the deceased and Meena. There are two suicide notes. In first suicide note, name of Meena- present petitioner has not been mentioned, however in second suicide note, Meena's name has also been added.

7. Counsel for the complainant has handed over a pen drive. I have watched the said pen drive. The video is of 16.12.2024 at 10:18 AM from CAM 2. In the video, a bike stopped across the road dropping a lady which has been mentioned as petitioner. She had covered her face with dupatta. In the second video clip from CAM 1 at 10:19 AM, petitioner was seen holding a blue polythene bag in her hand and enter a room. After a few seconds, she came out of the room and at the time, the bag was not in her hand and



CRM-M-19963-2025

went in another room. In CAM 5 at 12:16 PM, the deceased enters the house with tractor trolley and parked the same. It appears that he was unaware of petitioner's presence in the house. In CAM 1 at 12:18:16 PM, it shows that after taking turn, the old person who is above middle age enters the room where Meena was already present. After some time at 12:18:40 PM, he ran out of the room and went towards other part of the building. I have gone through the suicide note in which the deceased has named Rajender, Ram Mehar, Navneet, Jasbir, Raj Singh, Satyawan as responsible for his death. There is another suicide note in which date is not mentioned but name of Meena is mentioned. In the video, no part shows husband of Meena present at that time. Perusal of the video and suicide note makes one aspect extremely important whether at that time, petitioner's husband was present or not. As per complainant, Amit was married to Meena on 17.01.2021. After marriage, dispute arose between Amit and Meena. As per version of Amit, Meena started pressurizing him and his family members and started levelling false complaints against them. Because of such complaints, deceased and complainant were called to police station on numerous times. Perusal of FIR clearly mentions that Amit was not at home when Meena had entered the house, however he states that his mother and grandmother were present at home, as such it would be appropriate to refer to their version.

8. At the time when Meena had entered the house of the deceased, two persons namely Santosh and Bhanti were stated to be present inside. The police had recorded their statement under Section 180 BNSS. Santosh stated that she is mother-in-law of petitioner and stated that right after marriage, Meena had started creating chaos and troubling them and despite various efforts to re-concile and advise her, she did not mend her ways. In addition to Meena, Navneet, Rajinder, Ram Mehar and Jasveer all of them in connivance with Meena were quarreling with them and troubling them and would threaten them to do away with their lives. On 16.12.2024 at 10.15 AM, Meena came to their house along with some her family members who dropped her at gate. Subsequently, Meena sat in the drawing room which was at the beginning. At that time, she along with her mother-in-law were present at home. When her husband returned and entered the drawing room, then he noticed Meena sitting there. On reaching, Meena scuffled with him and threatened him that she will lodge a false case of molestation upon the deceased and based on which, they visited the DSP office and gave him written application. Thereafter, the deceased went out. Around 9.30 PM, when she called him to come back, he returned home. On 17.12.2024, around 6.30 AM, when her husband woke up, Meena was hurling abuses at them. In the meantime, the deceased took out his licensed pistol and shot himself dead. Statement of Bhanti is also to the similar extent. Statement of Bhanti as well as Santosh is corroborated where there is no evidence of going out of the house. Even the investigation points out towards Meena's presence in the morning when deceased shot himself dead.



CRM-M-19963-2025

All these circumstances are just preceding the suicide and directly connected to instigation and abetment and it can be safely assumed that had Meena not threatened to register a false case of molestation and hurled abuses in the morning, there was no reason for the deceased to shoot himself dead. Thus, the ingredients of abetment and instigation are made out.

9. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for anticipatory bail. The impact of crime would also not justify anticipatory bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

10. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

11. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

19.05.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.