



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

118

CRM-M-59798-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 24.02.2026

Chattar Pal

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. G.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. This second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.77 dated 25.04.2023, registered under Section(s) 302, 365, 323, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sadar, District Ludhiana.

2. Brief summarised, the brief facts of the present case are that:-

*“As per allegations, on 24.04.2023 at about 08:30 PM in the area of Police Station Sadar Ludhiana, all the accused including the applicant armed with sticks, baseball bats etc. formed an unlawful assembly with common object i.e. to murder Ujwal Kumar son of Jaswant Singh complainant and thereafter murdered him by assaulting him, they also voluntarily caused hurt to Amit, friend of deceased Ujwal Kumar and abducted Ujwal Kumar deceased in Innova Car bearing registration No. PB10-EC-0097 with the intent to cause him to be secretly and wrongfully confined.”.*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present FIR was registered on the statement of Jaswant Singh, father of deceased-Ujwal

Kumar. He contends that the case set up by the prosecution is that Amit Kumar, a friend of Ujwal Kumar (since deceased) had informed Jaswant Singh about the alleged occurrence. He submits that, however, no role has been attributed to the petitioner by the aforesaid Amit Kumar in causing any injury to the deceased. He contends that the statement of Jaswant Singh is based only on hear-say as same rests upon the information furnished by Amit Kumar, who is stated to be an eyewitness, however, Amit Kumar has not been cited as a witness by the prosecution in its final report submitted before the concerned Court. It is contended that the entire case thus, rests on the alleged confession of the petitioner recorded in custody and the recovery of a base-ball bat, which cannot be associated with the offence in question, as no blood-stains were found on the base-ball bat. Moreover, there is no other evidence collected which shows that the deceased had sustained any injury from the aforesaid bat. It is further contended that the petitioner has been in custody since 23.04.2025 and out of total 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far, hence, the trial would take a long time in its conclusion. It is also contended that total 09 persons were nominated as accused in the present case, out of which 07 have already been granted the concession of regular bail and the case of the petitioner is at par with them.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. He, however, contends that a confession had been recorded, wherein the petitioner admitted his presence at the place of occurrence and having caused injuries to the deceased with a base-ball bat, which stands recovered. He, however, does not dispute that there were no blood-stains on the recovered base-ball bat.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration that there would be arguable issues with respect to the participation of the petitioner in light of the arguments raised by the counsel for the petitioner and as noticed above, which are yet to be determined during the course of the trial and coupled with the period of actual custody already undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial as well as his clean antecedents and out of 09 accused, 07 have already been granted the concession of regular bail and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**24.02.2026**

*Mangal Singh*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No