



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

CRM-M No.55311 of 2025

Date of Decision: 09.04.2026

Sonia

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Nagar Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, D.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.75, dated 21.04.2024, under Section 302 (Sections 148, 149, 120-B, 201 of IPC added lateron) and Section 25 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 05 brothers and one of his brother is George @ Katta, who 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. On 21.04.2024 at about 9:30 AM, he received an information that a dead body of his brother, namely, George @ Katta, was lying in a vacant plot. On hearing, he reached at the place where number of people were already 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 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 petitioner approached the Court of Ld. Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides and finding no merits, her application was declined by the trial Court vide order dated 07.03.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-20130-2025, however, the same was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 30.04.2025. Hence, she is before this Court by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the false implication of the petitioner is writ large. He has submitted that case of the prosecution is purely based on circumstantial evidences. He submits that out of total 11 accused, 09 accused are already on bail. He submits that the case of the petitioner is on better footing than that of the co-accused, who have already been granted bail by this Court. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as she has never been involved in any other case. He thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as case of the petitioner is on better footings than that of the co-accused.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the case of the petitioner is distinguishable from that of the co-



accused, who have been granted bail. He submits that it is the petitioner with whom the deceased had illicit relations. He submits that all the accused had caused injuries to the deceased. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 31 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the case of prosecution is primarily based on the circumstantial evidences. As per the conclusion of the investigation, the complicity of the petitioner is surfaced on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 11 months and 13 days as on 08.04.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of 31 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined as on date.

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. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail.



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

09.04.2026

ps-I

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE