



CRM-M-68495-2025

-1-

**231b IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-68495-2025**

Date of Decision: 04.05.2026

Chintu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of UT, Chandigarh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Manjot Gujral, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Satish Kumar, Addl. PP, UT, Chandigarh
assisted by ASI Pawan Kumar.**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.88 dated 09.05.2024, registered under Section 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 506, 307, 302 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Sector 31, Chandigarh.

2. As per the facts of the case the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Roop Lal @ Nitin Kumar, father of deceased Vikas @ Rohit. It was alleged that he along with his son Vikas @ Rohit used to work as Carpenter. On 08.05.2024, he along with his son Rohit had gone to Zirakpur for their work. At about 7:15 p.m.-7:30 p.m., he returned home along with his son after finishing their work and his son Rohit @ Vikas left the house for Ravi Dass Temple, Ram Darbar to pay obeisance. It was further that after some time, a friend of his son disclosed to him on telephone that Aryan, Ravi, Rihan, Aryan, Rowdy, Arjun, Chintu (the petitioner), Armaan, Yash @ Golu who are also residents of Ram Darbar, attacked his son with wooden stick and Chopper like arms due to some old grudge and had caused injuries to him. The said friend of his son further informed him that he had taken his son to GMCH-32 for treatment.



CRM-M-68495-2025

-2-

On hearing the same, the complainant immediately reached GMCH-32 and attended his son. At that time, his son was speaking and when he asked about the persons who had attacked him, his son disclosed the names of Aryan, Rowdy, Chintu, Aryan, Arman, Rihan, Arjun, Yash @ Golu, Ravi, Sunny and told that said boys in furtherance of their common intention attacked him with stick, chopper etc. due to some old grudge. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 09.05.2024. Injured Vikas @ Rohit succumbed to the injuries on 18.05.2024. Petitioner approached learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, his application was declined after hearing both the sides vide order dated 30.04.2025. 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, Ravi Kumar. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders dated 26.11.2025 passed in **CRM-M-25961-2025**, whereby, co-accused Ravi Kumar, has been granted regular bail by this Court. 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, Ravi Kumar. He has placed



CRM-M-68495-2025

-3-

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 09.05.2024. Co-accused, namely, Ravi Kumar is on bail and as stated before this Court, his case is at par with that of the petitioner. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 11 months & 24 days as on 03.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

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.

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

04.05.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No