



CRM-M-14156-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-14156-2025
Date of decision : 20.03.2025

Aman @ Bheem

.....Petitioner

versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sunil Kumar Dahiya, Advocate for
Mr. Shubham, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP, UT, Chandigarh and
Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate, for UT, Chandigarh.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present second petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.102, dated 04.09.2023 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 324, 341, 307 and 506 of IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act added lateron, registered at Police Station Maloya, U.T. Chandigarh.
2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Bunty. It was alleged that on 03.09.2023 at about 9:20 pm, he was near petrol pump of Sector-38 West and in the meantime, 7-8 boys including Bhim (petitioner), Danger, Batti, Babrik came there. Bhim raised *lalkara* to catch hold the complainant and then he took out knife from his dub and gave the knife blows to him. The other boys also caused injuries to him with bricks and stones. On raising alarm, they escaped from the scene of occurrence and in the meantime, the PCR vehicle took him to PGI. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On the registration of FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 11.09.2023. The petitioner approached the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh praying for



grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, finding no merit, the same was declined by Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh vide its order dated 05.03.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-41117-2024, however, the same was allowed to be dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 02.09.2024. Hence the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Vikas @ Batti. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 19.02.2025 passed in **CRM-M-29103-2024**, whereby, co-accused Vikas @ Batti has been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the case of the petitioner is at par with the said co-accused. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 11.09.2023 and hence, he has completed incarceration of about 1½ years. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Vikas @ Batti. He has submitted that out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, 12 witnesses have been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the



CRM-M-14156-2025

-3-

record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 11.09.2023. Co-accused, namely, Vikas @ Batti is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Out of total 22 prosecution witnesses, 12 witnesses have been examined. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year 06 months and 03 days as on 20.03.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.03.2025
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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