

2025:PHHC:137873



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

217

**CRM-M-54324-2025  
Date of decision: 30.09.2025**

GHANIYA SAHNI ALIAS KANHIYA KUMAR .....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB .....Respondent

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

\*\*\*\*\*

Present: - Mr. Hardik Ahluwalia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

The instant first petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 101 dated 16.08.2023 under Sections 302 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. That as per the allegations in the FIR, the complainant (who is the mother of the deceased) has alleged that on 15.08.2023, her deceased son was sitting in the verandah of their house situated in the cremation ground and while she alongwith her family members was sitting inside the room, she heard the noise of "Maarta, Maarta" on which they came outside and saw that Prem Hamrao @ chottu armed with sharp weapon, Krishna

Chauhan armed with stick and the petitioner along with his co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Honey, armed with stick were beating her son, while the aforesaid Prem Hamrao@ Chottu attacked her son with the sharp weapon on the upper side of the right chest, below the shoulder and injured him and then they fled away along with their respective weapons, after which the victim was taken to Civil Hospital, Fatehgarh Sahib from where the doctors referred him to Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh where the victim succumbed to his injuries. Hence, on the basis of the above, the present FIR was registered.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the case of the petitioner is identical to that of co-accused Krishna Chauhan to whom regular bail has been granted by this Court vide order dated 29.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-54149-2025.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. Taking into consideration the same and extending parity to the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

9. 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.

**SEPTEMBER 30, 2025**

*Vishal Sharma*

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No