

Manoj versus State of Haryana

CNR No. HRPL0100-5662-2026

CIS No.BA-1500-2026

-1-

HRPL010056622026



Presented on : 02-07-2026
Registered on : 02-07-2026
Decided on : 03-07-2026
Duration : 0 years, 0 months, 1 days

**IN THE COURT OF
Additional District and Sessions Judge
AT ,Palwal
(Presided Over by Ms. Sukirti)
BA/1500/2026**

Manoj, son of Sh. Hukam Chand, resident of village Raidaska, P S Sadar
Palwal, Tehsil and District Palwal.

.....Applicant-accused

Versus.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

FIR No. 275 dated 10.11.2025
U/s : 108, 85 BNS
P.S. Sadar Palwal

FIRST APPLICATION FOR BAIL UNDER SECTION 483 BNSS

Argued by: Shri B.L. Soni, Advocate for applicant/accused.
Shri Netram, Public Prosecutor for the State
assisted by SI Rashid Khan, IO, P.S Sadar Palwal

ORDER

This is to dispose of **first** bail application under section 483
BNSS filed on behalf of applicant-accused Manoj, son of Sh. Hukam
Chand in case bearing FIR No. 275 dated 10.11.2025, under sections 85,
108 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, Police Station, Sadar Palwal.

2. In the present case, the criminal law was set into motion on

(Sukirti)
Addl. Sessions Judge,
Palwal, 03.7.2026
UID No. HR0258

the basis of the complaint given by complainant Balram whereby he alleged that the marriage of his sister Amarwati was solemnized with applicant-accused Manoj as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. They had given sufficient dowry articles in the marriage. Marriage of his elder sister Radha was also solemnized with Dushyant, brother of accused on the same day. Dushyant resides separately. Out of the said wedlock, Amarwati gave birth to a son. At that time his sister Amarwati was 3-4 months pregnant. The marriage of his sisters were solemnized in April 2016. Accused Manoj and his family members were not happy with the dowry articles given in the marriage. Accused Manoj demanded one car and his parents demanded Rs.5 lacs cash. Many times his sister Amarwati told about the dowry demands. They also talked to Manoj and his parents, but they did not mend their ways. Soon after the marriage, they all started harassing his sister on the demand of dowry. Earlier also, the accused persons after giving beatings to her had thrown her out of the matrimonial home. About 15 days ago, he sent his sister to her matrimonial home after giving Rs. One lac, but the accused persons were not satisfied with the same. On 08.11.2025, in the evening, at about 07/08 p.m, he received a telephonic call from his sister that accused persons were not satisfied with the dowry and they would kill her at any time. Her life was in danger. On 10.11.2025, at about 03/04.00 a.m, he received a telephonic call from his elder brother-

in-law Rajesh that his sister Amarwati was killed by her in-laws. On receiving that information, he alongwith his father and other family members went to her matrimonial home and found his sister hanging with a red coloured cloth. On these allegations, present FIR was registered under sections 108, 85, 3(5) BNS. Investigation was carried out by SI Dharampal. Proceedings under section 194 BNSS were conducted. Place of occurrence was visited. Site plan was prepared. Statements of witnesses were recorded. Accused Manoj was arrested on 11.11.2025. During investigation, Hukam Singh and Shakuntla, parents of accused were found innocent.

3. In the bail application, the applicant-accused has contended that he has been falsely implicated by the police whereas the applicant has no concern with the same. That the contents of the FIR are false and fabricated and said FIR was registered after thought in collusion with the police by the complainant. That the applicant is having one minor son and there is no one to lookafter his minor son except the applicant-accused. That nothing has been recovered from the possession of the applicant-accused. That applicant-accused is in custody since 11.11.2025. That the investigation has already been completed and challan has been filed. That the trial of the case is likely to take along time.

4. In response, IO has filed the reply opposing the bail

application on the ground that if the applicant-accused be released on bail, he may influence the witnesses.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant-accused argued that he has been falsely implicated in the present case, as he has never harassed the deceased in connection with any demand of dowry as alleged in the complaint. He further argued that as per the prosecution case, in the disclosure statement, the accused has disclosed that he gave his wife Rs.65000/- to keep in safe custody, but instead, she gave them to her parents without asking him. He argued that in the said disclosure statement, the allegations of dowry demand have nowhere been mentioned. He further argued that the applicant-accused is in custody since 11.11.2025 and he has no criminal record. He prayed for allowing the bail application.

6. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor for the state opposed the bail application on the ground that accused was actively involved in the present case. He prayed for dismissal of the bail application.

7. I have heard the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant-accused and the learned Public Prosecutor for the State as well as Investigating Officer.

8. In the present case, accused has been charge-sheeted under sections 85, 108 BNS. The applicant-accused is in custody since

11.11.2025 . Investigation has been completed and challan has been filed. Charge has been framed. No prior complaint regarding harassment or suicide note has been placed on record. No medical report regarding prior beatings has also been placed on record. The antecedents of the applicant-accused are clear. The conclusion of trial would take a long time. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the applicant-accused in judicial custody further.

9. For the aforesaid reasons, the first bail application filed on behalf of applicant-accused Manoj is hereby allowed and he is ordered to be released from custody in this case on furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rs. One Lakh only) with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of this Court/Duty Magistrate, Palwal.

10. No expression of this order shall be construed to be an opinion upon the merits of the case.

11. A copy of this order be sent to the Superintendent of the concerned Jail by way of email.

12. Papers be tagged with the the main file.

Pronounced in open Court.

Santosh Kumari, Stenographer-I

**(Sukirti)
Addl. Sessions Judge
Palwal, 03.7.2026
(UID No. HR0258)**

Note:- All the pages have been checked and signed by the undersigned.

**(Sukirti)
Addl. Sessions Judge
Palwal, (UID No. HR0258)**

**(Sukirti)
Addl. Sessions Judge,
Palwal, 03.7.2026
UID No. HR0258**

Manoj versus State of Haryana

CNR No. HRPL0100-5662-2026

CIS No.BA-1500-2026

-6-

Present: Shri B.L. Soni, Advocate for applicant/accused.
Shri Netram, Public Prosecutor for the State
assisted by SI Rashid Khan, IO, P.S Sadar Palwal

Reply to the bail application filed. Copy supplied.
Arguments heard. Order pronounced.

Vide separate order of even date, *the first bail application under Section 483 BNSS filed on behalf of applicant Manoj stands allowed. Papers be tagged with the main case file.*

Pronounced in open Court.

(Sukirti)
Addl. Sessions Judge
Palwal.03.7.2026
(UID No. HR0258)

Santosh Kumari, Stenographer-I

(Sukirti)
Addl. Sessions Judge,
Palwal, 03.7.2026
UID No. HR0258