



CRM-M-18836-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-18836-2026

Date of Decision: 16.04.2026

Vicky @ Rajesh Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vipul Babuta, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuljinder Dhindsa, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.74 dated 04.06.2024, registered under Sections 302, 506, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Meharban, Ludhiana.

2. As per the facts of the case the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sarabjit Kaur. It was alleged that on 02.06.2024, her father, namely, Sukhwinder Singh (deceased) along with her brother, namely, Gurpreet Singh were trying to remove the sewage water that was collected outside their house. At about 9:30 pm, Amarjit Kaur and her husband Jagdish, Rani, Jaswinder Singh @ Bindar, Bindri, Vicky (the petitioner), Lucky and Golu @ Manpreet Singh started resisting the same. After the heated arguments, the dispute escalated and they all started beating her father Sukhwinder Singh. Amarjit Kaur pushed her father and as a result of which, he fell down and thereafter, Rani raised lalkara to teach him a lesson. Thereafter, Jaswinder Singh @ Binder gave a brick blow on the head of her father. Vicky gave kick blows on the stomach and ribs and others also



gave kick blows while he was lying down. While lying down, Bindri held her father from the hair and gave forceful blow of bricks in the backside of the head, due to which her father fell unconscious. Thus, her father suffered injuries and thus, he was shifted to Civil Hospital, Ludhiana where he died on 03.06.2024. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 27.08.2025. Petitioner approached learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, his application was declined after hearing both the sides vide order dated 30.03.2026. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court 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, Balwinder Kumar @ Bindri. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 03.02.2026 passed in **CRM-M-4837-2026**, whereby, co-accused Balwinder Kumar @ Bindri, has been granted regular bail by this Court. To buttress his arguments, he submits that complainant Sarabjit Kaur and one eye witness Paramjit Kaur, have been examined before the trial Court and they have not supported the case of the prosecution and thus, they turned hostile. He further submits that the petitioner has been alleged to have given kick blows and thus, he was not armed with any lethal weapon. To buttress his arguments, he submits that the petitioner has been attributed kick blows, whereas, co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court, has been granted brick blows. 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, Balwinder Kumar @ Bindri. 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 was arrested in this case on 27.08.2025. Co-accused, namely, Balwinder Kumar @ Bindri is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 07 months & 19 days as on 15.04.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. As submitted before this Court, the complainant and one eye witness, were examined before the trial Court and they have not supported the case of the prosecution and thus, they were turned hostile.

6. 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. 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.

7. 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.



CRM-M-18836-2026

-4-

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

16.04.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Whether Reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE