



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

224

CRM-M-54149-2025  
Date of decision: 29.09.2025

KRISHNA CHAUHAN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondents

**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 registered under Sections 302 read with Section 34 of the IPC at Police Station Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case are that mother of the deceased namely Sat Rahul was sitting in the Verandah of their house on 15.08.2023 when she heard the noise of "Maarta, Maarta". She came out and saw that Prem Hamrao @ Chottu armed with a sharp weapon alongwith the petitioner, Ghaannaiya Sahni and Harpreet Singh alias Honey, all armed with sticks were beating her son.

3. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the stab injury on the

deceased Sat Rahul was attributed to Prem Hamrao @ chottu which resulted into death of deceased Sat Rahul. He contends that the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of more than two years and only 05 witnesses out of the total 18 witnesses have been examined so far and the eye-witnesses to the incident have already been examined. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand contends that the petitioner was accompanied by the other co-accused in the said incident, hence, the element of common intention is fully made out. He further submits that the eye-witnesses had supported the case of prosecution. He, however, does not dispute that the petitioner has been in custody for more than two years and the trial is proceeding at a very slow pace and only 05 witnesses have been examined so far.

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

6. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances, clean antecedents of the petitioner, the period of actual custody as well as stage of trial, 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 29, 2025

*Vishal Sharma*

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

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