



CRM-M-69333-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-69333-2025

Date of Decision: 30.04.2026

Parmod Kumar Chauhan

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Abhaysher Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.K.D.Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.67 dated 18.04.2025, registered under Section 105 BNS, 2023 at Police Station City Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Asha Devi. It was alleged that on 17.04.2025, at about 10:44 p.m., her son Jatinder Kumar received a call on his phone number from Jai Chand, employee of Lakshmi Rice Mills and told that Parmod Kumr Chauhan (petitioner) who is a labourer in the said Rice Mill beaten Narinder Kumar (husband of the complainant), due to which he become unconscious. They shifted injured Narinder Kumar to hospital, however, he was declared brought dead. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprit. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Postmortem of the dead body was conducted. The petitioner was arrested on 19.04.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional



CRM-M-69333-2025

-2-

Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib praying for the grant of bail. However after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the bail application filed by both the petitioner vide order dated 05.09.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that as per the case of the prosecution, the allegation against the petitioner is to the effect that he gave fist and leg blows to the deceased, namely, Narinder Kumar on 17.04.2025. He contends that Narinder Kumar died on the next date of the occurrence i.e. on 18.04.2025. He contends that the ocular version is also not medically corroborated. He further contends that the cause of death as opined by the Doctor was found to be complications of Myocardial hypertrophy, which is a natural disease. He submits that the petitioner is a 20 years old boy, who has no criminal antecedents. He contends that the investigation is already complete and charges are also framed. He, thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that petitioner caused injury to the deceased, due to which he died in the hospital on the next day. On instructions, he has submitted that challan is presented and charges are framed, however, out of total 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it



CRM-M-69333-2025

-3-

is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case took place on 17.04.2025. The petitioner has been alleged to have given fist and leg blow to the deceased, Narinder Kumar. He died on 18.04.2025. As per the postmortem report, cause of death found to be complications of Myocardial hypertrophy. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year & 10 days as on 29.04.2026. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Out of 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined.

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. 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.

7. 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.

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

30.04.2026
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No