

2025:PHHC:125956



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

**CRM-M No.13426 of 2025
Date of Decision: 12.09.2025
Reserved on: 02.09.2025**

Narender Kumar @ Narender

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Ms. Nisha Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Rohit Rana, Advocate,
for Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The petitioner has sought concession of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.175 dated 11.04.2023 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 324, 307, 302 and 506 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (For short "Act, 1959") at Police Station Kheripul, District Faridabad on the complaint lodged by Tulle Ram alleging that the petitioner along with his mother Vidya Devi had opened an assault upon his wife in the morning of 11.04.2023. Thereafter, the petitioner formed an unlawful assembly with the other accused, all of whom opened an assault upon the complainant and his family members. His son Yadram

2025:PHHC:125956



was assaulted with a knife by the accused Gaurav whereas the petitioner along with others had given kicks and fist blows to the complainant and his family members. Initially, a case under Sections 148, 307, 323, 324 and 506 of IPC read with Section 149 of IPC and Section 25 of Act, 1959 was registered. The victim Yadram succumbed to his injuries and died. Offence under Section 302 of IPC was added. The petitioner who was named as one of the assailants was arrested on 15.04.2023. The previous petition as filed by the petitioner had been dismissed on 04.12.2024.

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is a change in the circumstances since the co-accused Vidya Devi whose case was on similar footing has been extended benefit of bail by Hon'ble Supreme Court. It is submitted that due to this substantive change in the circumstances, the petitioner too deserves to be released on bail.

3. While refuting the contentions so raised, it is vehemently argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana assisted by learned counsel for the complainant that since the previous petition as filed by the petitioner had been dismissed by passing a detailed order, therefore, no new or substantive ground to extend benefit of bail is made out in his favour and hence, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

4. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

5. As per the allegations, the accused Vidya Devi precipitated the crime by initially pulling the wife of the complainant outside her house and assaulting her. Then she had caught hold of the victim by neck whereas the accused Gaurav had struck knife blows on the person of the victim which



resulted in his death. The petitions filed by the petitioner as well as co-accused Vidya Devi had been dismissed by this Court vide common order dated 04.12.2024. Since the case of the petitioner is at the same footing as that of the above named accused Vidhya whose has been extended benefit of bail by the Hon’ble Supreme Court and since both of them had been arrested within a gap of one day and the accused Vidya Devi has been extended benefit of bail, hence Keeping in view the period of incarceration already undergone by him and on the ground of parity, as such, the present petitioner has also become entitled to be released on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

6. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

12.09.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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