



222

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

CRM-M-36665-2025

Date of decision : 04.12.2025

Sonu Singh**....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Ms. Chandanpreet Kaur Ahluwalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.154 dated 16.05.2023, under Sections 302, 120-B IPC (Sections 148, 149, 201 IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station Tripri Patiala, District Patiala.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Shish Pal Singh son of Gurdial Singh. It was alleged that the complainant was running a Barber shop. His son Gurpreet @ Monu, aged 25 years also worked as a Barber. His son Gurpreet @ Monu had performed love marriage with Archana about 4-5 years ago. On 15.05.2023, the complainant met with his son and left for his village in District Kaithal. His son Gurpreet @ Monu had told him that some anti social elements including Nimish, Yash @ Jodha, Karan Sandhu, Mani Cheema, Irshit @ Jogi, Harsh, Monu, Sonu (petitioner)

Malkeet @ Chitta, Jashan and 2-3 unknown boys were threatening him



from last few days. When the complainant reached his father-in-law's house, his wife got a call that Jogi, Karan Sandhu, Jashan alongwith 10-12 persons had inflicted injuries to their son Gurpreet @ Monu and killed him. It was alleged that these persons were nurturing grudge against his son since long and thus, he was killed by the accused persons. Hence, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. The petitioner were arrested on 04.01.2025. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, same was dismissed vide order dated 06.05.2025. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Yash Vaid @ Yodha and Nimish @ Jashan. He submits that the role attributed to co-accused, namely, Yash Vaid @ Yodha, that he had given a knife blow to the deceased, whereas, the petitioner had been alleged to have pelted stones. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the common order dated 04.11.2025 passed by this Court in **CRM-M-28348-2024 and CRM-M-56382-2024**, respectively, whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Yash Vaid @ Yodha and Nimish @ Jashan, have been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is even on better footing than that of the co-accused, who have been granted bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Status report by way of affidavit of Mr. Jangjit Singh, PPS,



behalf of respondent-State, in the Court today, same is taken on record.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner. However, he endorsed the fact that case of the petitioner is at parity with that of co-accused, namely, Yash Vaid @ Yodha and Nimish @ Jashan, who have been granted bail by this Court. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Shish Pal Singh. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Yash Vaid @ Yodha and Nimish @ Jashan, have already been granted bail by this Court vide common order dated 04.11.2025 passed by this Court in **CRM-M-28348-2024** and **CRM-M-56382-2024**, respectively. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 10 months and 27 days as on 03.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 01 more case.

7. 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.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Thus, 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.

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.

10. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

04.12.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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