

2025:PHHC:161241



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

245

CRM-M-63324-2025

Date of decision: 19.11.2025

KAJAL

..PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

..RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

1. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.75 dated 21.04.2024, under Section 302 IPC (Sections 148, 149, 120-B, 201 of IPC added lateron) and Sections 25, 27, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

2. 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 five 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 home. 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

CRM-M-63324-2025

-2-

plot. On hearing, he reached at the place where number of people gathered. On reaching, 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 all 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, she 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 petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides and finding no merits, their application was declined by the trial Courts vide orders dated 24.07.2024 respectively. Aggrieved by the same, 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 to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co accused, namely, Ajay Kumar alias Ajaydeep alias Baba and Gomti @ Preeti. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 06.08.2025, passed in CRM-M-32121 of 2025 and CRM-M-41243-2025 whereby, co-accused Ajay Kumar alias Ajaydeep alias



CRM-M-63324-2025

-3-

Baba and Gomti @ Preeti have been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since 22.04.2024. 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 State counsel 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, Ajay Kumar alias Ajaydeep alias Baba and Gomti @ Preeti. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 22.04.2024. Co-accused, namely, Ajay Kumar @ Ajaydeep @ Baba and Gomti @ Preeti are on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with them. Custody certificate of the petitioner would reveal that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 06 months & 22 days as on 17.11.2025. It further reveals that the petitioner is not involved in any case.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments



CRM-M-63324-2025

-4-

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.

7. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

November 19, 2025
Poonam Sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No