

2025:PHHC:141231



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

209

**CRM-M-55585-2025
Date of decision: 13.10.2025**

ROHIT KUMARPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Rahil Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Jainainder Saini, Advocate
for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant second petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 18 dated 21.01.2025, registered under Section(s) 115(2), 127(2) and 108 read with Section 3 (5) of the BNS, 2023 (earlier Sections 103(1), 61 BNS deleted) at Police Station Sector-5, Gurugram.
2. The brief facts of the present case are that the FIR has been registered on the complaint of Krishan Kumar who stated that he has two sons, Navdeep (about 35 years old) and Amit (about 32 years old). Navdeep

**CRM-M-55585-2025**

-2-

had built his own house in Ashok Vihar, Gurugram and lived there with his wife Seema (daughter of Ramkumar, resident of Kutiyawali, police station Adampur, District Hisar) and daughter Naisa and worked in a private company as a software engineer. Marriage between Navdeep and Seema was solemnized about 03 years ago and he has been living in his own house in Gurugram for about a year. The complainant stated that there was a dispute between Navdeep and Seema, and after quarrelling Seema used to call her parents and inform her father, brothers and other family members and used to go live with her parents but used to return home later. The complainant stated that this has been going on for a long time. On 21.01.2025 the complainant spoke to his son and had a normal conversation, however, when he called him at around 4:48 PM in the evening, his son did not pick up his call and the complainant called his nephew Ajay, who also used to live in Gurugram and asked him to go to Navdeep's house and make him talk to him. Thereafter Ajay went to Navdeep's house and informed the complainant that Navdeep was lying dead in his room and his neck was tied to the bed sheet. The complainant informed SEC-5 police station Gurugram about this and left for Navdeep's house with his family. On reaching Navdeep's house, the complainant saw that Navdeep was lying dead on the floor in the room and a knot was tied around his neck with a bed sheet. There were injury marks on his hands and there was dried blood all over his face. Upon inquiring about this in the neighborhood, the complainant came to know that Navdeep's wife Seema, Seema's father Ram Kumar and Seema's brother had come to the house in an Alto car and at around 4-4:30



CRM-M-55585-2025

-3-

PM and later they were seen leaving Navdeep's house in a hurry. The complainant got registered the FIR alleging that his daughter-in-law Seema alongwith her father and her brothers had strangled his son Navdeep to death and strictest possible Legal action should be taken against those who have killed his son.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that initially the case was registered for commission of offence under Section 103(1) and 61 of the BNS, however, after the investigation, the said charges were dropped as no case of murder was made out and the chargesheet has been filed only for offence under Section 108, 115(2), 127(2), 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 as the medical and the circumstantial evidence suggest that the deceased had committed suicide and the Charges have also been framed for the said offence only. He contends that as per the allegations, the complainant-father of the deceased was not present at the place and that he came to the spot only after been called upon by the relatives and neighbours and that too after the police had already reached the spot. He contends that notwithstanding the same neither the neighbours/nor the complainant-father of the deceased have been nominated as a witnesses in the instant case. It is contended that as per the investigation, simple injuries are stated to have been caused to deceased-Navdeep Singh and the petitioner was nominated as accused as he his cousin brother of co-accused Seema. Moreover, Counsel argues that after the accused have left the place of occurrence, the deceased committed suicide by hanging himself with the aid of the bed sheet. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since



CRM-M-55585-2025

-4-

23.01.2025 and the investigation is complete. No witness out of a total 29 witnesses have been examined so far, hence, the trial is likely to take long. It is further submitted that petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

4. Mr. Jaininder Saini, Advocate appears on behalf of the complainant and files his Vakalatnama which is taken on record. He contends that the specific allegations against the petitioner is having caused injuries to the deceased as the post mortem report shows that there were injury marks on the body of the deceased. He further contends that there is a strong probability of the petitioners having murdered-Navdeep by hanging him. He submits that they are in the process of filing revision against the order of framing of charge.

5. Learned State Counsel on the other hand is not in dispute that the investigation in the case has already been concluded and the charge has been framed for commission of offence under Section 108 of the BNS, 2023 and that no witness has been examined so far. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

6. Further, the State Counsel also not in dispute that the complainant-father of the deceased Navdeep was not an eye-witness and that no witness from the neighbourhood has been cited as a prosecution witness.

7. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

8. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the nature of allegations, the charge framed, the period of custody and the clean antecedents of the petitioner as well as bearing in mind the stage of the



CRM-M-55585-2025

-5-

trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

9. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

10. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

OCTOBER 13, 2025

Vishal Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No