



229

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

CRM-M No.7047 of 2026

Date of Decision: 12.02.2026

Paramjeet Singh @ Ghon

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Jashanjot Singh Uppal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., 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.42, dated 11.05.2024, under Sections 341, 323, 452, 506, 148, 149 IPC (Sections 307, 325, 324 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Maloud, Police District Khanna.
2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Gurcharan Singh. It was alleged that on 08.05.2024, at about 11:30 P.M., some persons started banging gates of the house of complainant and his nephew, namely, Karamjit Singh. Thereafter, the complainant came out and saw that Gopi, Ghon @ Karma, Kaka and Channi along with unknown man, who were having iron rods, baseball and iron dah in their hands, standing in the street and breaking the doors of the house of nephew of complainant. It was



alleged that the complainant, out of the fear, came to the terrace of the house of complainant and then, all the persons along with their weapons came to the terrace of complainant and surrounded his nephew. Gopi gave *gandasi* blow on the back side of the head of Karamjit Singh, then, Channi gave an *iron dah* blow on the head of Karamjit Singh, which hit on the right side of the head. Thereafter, Kaka gave *baseball* blow on the head of Karamjit Singh, which hit on his forehead and thus, he became unconscious and fell down on the terrace. The blood was oozing out of his head. In the meantime, Ghan @ Karma, i.e. the petitioner, gave iron dah blow on the head of Gurjit Singh, which hit on his left ear and left side of the head and due to which, Gurjit Singh also became unconscious and fell down. On raising noise and seeing the gathering, the accused ran away from the spot along with their weapons. Then, all were shifted to CHC Maloud for treatment. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 15.06.2025. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 03.01.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail

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. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order passed by this Court in CRM-M



No.311 of 2025 dated 27.10.2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Nirmal Singh @ Gopi, has been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of petitioner is similar to that of the 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, Nirmal Singh @ Gopi. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 15.06.2025 Co-accused, namely, Nirmal Singh @ Gopi is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 07 months and 25 days as on 11.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other 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. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time.

8. 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 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.

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

12.02.2026	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
<i>rittu</i>	JUDGE
Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No