



CRM-M-64545-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-64545-2025

Date of Decision: 20.11.2025

Monica @ Monika

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present second petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.42 dated 19.03.2023 under Sections 302, 307, 452, 148, 149 and 201 of IPC registered at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. As per the facts of the case, the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Tilak Raj. It was alleged that the complainant's son, namely, Rahul is separated from his wife. It was alleged that after separation, one Jyoti Kalra D/o of Kala Ram is staying with his son from last about 02 years with her own wish. It was further alleged that on 19.03.2023 the complainant along with his son was razing the roof of their old house for renovation and at about 03:20 pm, Kala Ram father of Jyoti Kalra armed with *ghota* along with 09 other accused persons including the petitioner armed with their respective weapons, came there and attacked his son Rahul and inflicted grievous injuries upon him. When the complainant



raised alarm, his neighbours gathered in the street and by seeing them all the assailants fled away from the spot along with their respective weapons. Thereafter, Rahul was taken to Civil Hospital, Malout, where he succumbed to the injuries. The request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On the basis of the statement, FIR was registered and investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 09.01.2025 . He approached learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 05.08.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of 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, Ankush @ Ankush Kumar. He has argued that the allegation against the co-accused was that he gave a danda blow on the eye of the deceased whereas the allegation against the present petitioner is that she gave a danda blow on the thigh of the deceased. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 22.04.2025, passed in **CRM-M-51045-2023**, whereby, co-accused Ankush @ Ankush Kumar has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of her arrest. She 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



CRM-M-64545-2025

-3-

petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Ankush @ Ankush Kumar.

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 the date of her arrest. Co-accused, namely, Ankush @ Ankush Kumar is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate of the petitioner would reveal that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 10 months & 09 days as on 18.11.2025. It further reveals that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

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 her 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.

20.11.2025*ps-I***(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No