



224

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

**CRM-M No.27899 of 2025
Date of Decision: 26.05.2025**

Sohil @ Sohail @ Parontha**.....Petitioner**

versus

State of Punjab**..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate for
Mr. Bharat Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. J. S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.75 dated 21.04.2024, under Section 302 IPC, (Sections 148, 34, 149, 120-B & 201 of IPC and Sections 25, 27 & 54 of Arms Act added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar (Annexure P-1).

3. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Raj Kumar. It was alleged that they are 05 brothers and one of his brother is George @ Katta, was working as an Electrician. On 20.04.2024, he went out of the house at about 8:00 PM and thereafter he did not return. On 21.04.2024 at about 9:30 AM, he received an information that dead body of his brother, namely, George @ Katta, was lying in a vacant plot. On hearing, he reached at the place where number of people gathered. On reaching there,



he saw that face and head of his brother had been hit with sharp edged weapon. It was alleged that his brother George @ Katta was killed by some unknown person by causing injuries with sharp edged weapons. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. On 22.04.2024, supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded, wherein he named 11 accused including the petitioner. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 22.04.2024. On the completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial Court commenced with the trial. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the application filed by the petitioner was declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide order dated 18.03.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the case of prosecution is based on the circumstantial evidence, however, the petitioner has been roped in the present case on the basis of presumptions and assumptions. It is submitted that the occurrence in the present case had taken place on 20.04.2024 and the FIR was registered on the very next day, i.e. 21.04.2024, and the complainant did not name any of the accused, however, on 22.04.2024, the supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded and in due deliberated manner, the petitioner was roped in the present case. He has submitted that during the investigation, co-accused, namely, Sonia, was arrested and her disclosure



statement was recorded. It is submitted that Sonia had allegedly illicit relations with the deceased and on account of the same, as disclosed by co-accused Sonia, there was a dispute between her and the deceased. Hence, Sonia allegedly in conspiracy with the rest of the accused had committed the murder of the deceased- George @ Katta. He submits that co-accused of the petitioner, namely, *Manjit Singh @ Mann and Jagpreet @ Jaggu* have already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 30.04.2025 passed in *CRM-M No.55732 of 2024 and CRM-M No.2424 of 2025* and thus, case of the petitioner is at par with that of the co-accused, who have been granted bail by this Court. He has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and thus, he deserves to be granted bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioners in due conspiracy with the co-accused, namely, Sonia, had committed the murder of the brother of the complainant. He submit that the disclosure statement of the co-accused, Sonia, was recorded and the complicity of the petitioner has been duly established in committing the murder of the deceased. He, on instructions, submits that out of total 31 prosecution witnesses only 03 witness have been examined. He has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner. He has further endorsed the fact that co-accused of the petitioner have already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 30.04.2025.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the case of the prosecution is based on the circumstantial evidences. The petitioner has been arrayed as an accused on



recording the supplementary statement of the complainant. As per the case of the prosecution, some recoveries of the deceased have been made, however, those recoveries have been effected from the co-accused and not from the petitioner. Custody certificate of the petitioner would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year and 28 days as on 24.05.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. As submitted before this Court, out of 31 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined. Co-accused of the petitioner have already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 30.04.2025.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The petitioner is in custody since the date of his arrest, i.e. 22.04.2024 and co-accused, namely, ***Manjit Singh @ Mann and Jagpreet @ Jaggu***, whose case is stated to be at par with the petitioner, have already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 30.04.2025. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail on the basis of parity as the co-accused, namely, ***Manjit Singh @ Mann and Jagpreet @ Jaggu*** have already been admitted to bail by this Court as stated above.

9. 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.

26.05.2025
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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