



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55106 of 2024(O&M)

Date of Order:16.09.2025

Vishal

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Pankaj Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitiz Bharati, AAG, Haryana

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE

Petitioner seeks regular bail in case vide FIR No.35, dated 18.05.2024, under Section 304-B and 498-A IPC, Police Station GRP, Panipat, District Panipat. This is his first petition for regular bail.

As per FIR, Sagar son of Ishwar Singh, brother of deceased lodged a complaint stating that his real sister was married with Vishal son of Narender. At the time of marriage, dowry as per demand of the father-in-law, mother-in-law and uncle of Vishal was given. Two days before marriage, Heena's brother-in-law and Vikas demanded a car, but when they expressed inability, demand of motorcycle was raised which was met. The parents-in-law and Madan were adamant in their demands. Heena's husband, Vishal did not talk to her during and after the marriage. All of them started harassing her. Many a times, Heena told him that her sister-in-law, brothers-in-law Akash and Sagar taunted her for not bringing car. She was beaten, abused and tortured. Vishal thrashed her and threatened to kill her and



marry someone else. In February, 2024, he and his family members requested them not to harass Heena and assured that demand of car would be fulfilled. Yet, Heena was beaten on one or the other pretext. On 12.05.2024, Heena called him up and informed that she was being thrashed and threatened with death; that her mother-in-law asked her to die unless car was arranged. On 13.05.2024, he learnt that Heena had died. He suspected that Narendra, mother-in-law Sudesh, brother-in-law Vikas, Sagar, Akash, Madan and his sister's husband Vishal killed Heena and disposed of her body on the railway track for not fulfilling the demand of car, under a well planned conspiracy. Vishal's family also threatened to kill them.

It has been argued that there was five days delay in registration of the FIR and prior thereto, no complaint of any kind was moved before the authorities regarding cruelty or harassment for dowry. It was further argued that no other family member of deceased came forward to lodge complaint and only her brother was prosecuting the case. Referring to copy of statement of the Loco Pilot on duty, it was pointed out that deceased herself stepped inside the track with her back towards the train and the train hit her as it could not halt in time. It was urged that there was no indication of murder and petitioner, who was in judicial custody with effect from 21.06.2024, deserved to be enlarged on regular bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail on the ground of seriousness of allegations. He has placed on record custody certificate.

Petitioner, husband of deceased Heena, has been booked for causing dowry death of his wife. Allegations against him are serious,



specific and grave. Considering the gravity of the offence, the role attributed to the petitioner and all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, it is not a fit case to grant regular bail despite the period of incarceration. The application for regular bail is dismissed.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion on merits of the case.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

16th September, 2025
nt

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