



CRM-M-19670-2025

-1-

219

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

CRM-M-19670-2025

Date of Decision:- 17.09.2025

**Shyamdhhar Yadav**

...Petitioner

Versus

**State of Haryana**

...Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present:- Mr. Karav Kaushal, Advocate with  
Mr. Abhimanyu Jangra, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Abhishek Yadav, DAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI, J.(Oral)**

1. Petitioner – Shyamdhhar Yadav has filed petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in FIR No. 426 dated 18.07.2024 under Section 3(5), 80 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (akin to Section 304-B of IPC) (Section 3(5) of BNS deleted later on) registered at Police Station Sector-10A, Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. Facts of the case are, complainant Vijay Shankar gave his statement that his daughter Komal Yadav got married with Shyamdhhar Yadav on 08.06.2020. He had performed marriage with great pomp and show as per their customs and traditions. Couple lived happily for about one year. Thereafter, Shyamdhhar Yadav came to Gurugram and started living in Sector-95. His daughter also started living with him. She gave



birth to a daughter. After marriage, she was harassed by her mother-in-law and sister-in-law for dowry. After delivery of child, both of them came and started pressurizing his daughter to bring Rs. 2 lacs in cash and a chain. She protested that her parents are poor, therefore, they will not be able to satisfy their demand. She was beaten up and locked in a room for several days. She was not permitted to talk to her family members. She was not permitted to talk even on the mobile phone of her husband. She was killed inside her room on 17.07.2024 and her body was thrown from the roof at about 05:00 am in order to show that it was a case of suicide. In fact, his daughter was killed by her husband, mother-in-law and sister-in-law on account of their demands. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that allegations levelled against him are false. He was arrested in this case on 18.07.2024 and since then he is behind the bars. Challan was presented on 11.10.2024. His application for bail was dismissed as withdrawn as per order dated 17.12.2024 before the trial Court. He again approached the trial Court for bail which was declined vide order dated 13.03.2025 (Annexure P-2). Now at present all material witnesses have been examined. Statements of Vijay Shankar PW-1 and Ram Mani PW-2 are annexed who did not support prosecution case. PW Shiv Shankar was given up being won over by accused. Petitioner cannot be kept behind the bars for indefinite time period. He is ready to abide by terms and conditions of bail order. Therefore, his regular bail petition may be allowed.



4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed. It is submitted that information was received at police station on 17.07.2024 that a woman namely Komal had a fall from 11<sup>th</sup> floor of Ramson Society, Sector-95, Gurugram and was taken to RV Hospital. Police party reached there. Copy of MLR was procured. Dead body of Komal was kept in mortuary. Police party visited the spot and started investigation. Vijay Shankar complainant filed a complaint on 18.07.2024, on the basis of which present FIR was lodged. There are specific serious allegations against the petitioner who is husband of deceased victim. It is a case of unnatural death within three years of marriage on account of demand of dowry. Witnesses are yet to be examined. Therefore, petitioner is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. In the case in hand, victim fell from 11<sup>th</sup> floor of building in early morning on 17.07.2024 and died. Present petitioner is husband of deceased victim. It is a case of unnatural death within three years of marriage. Learned counsel for petitioner has referred to testimonies of complainant Vijay Shankar PW-1 and Ram Mani PW-2, who did not support prosecution case. In fact, aforesaid witnesses are not eye witnesses. Entire prosecution case is based on circumstantial evidence. Other material witnesses are yet to be examined. Present petitioner is main accused. Considering the facts and circumstances of case, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to petitioner Shyamdhara Yadav and petition filed by him is,



CRM-M-19670-2025

-4-

accordingly, dismissed.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

17.09.2025

*lalit*

**(AMARJOT BHATTI)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No