



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

205

CRM-M-7712-2025

Date of Decision: 28.04.2025

JAGAN NATH

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Tarun Deora, Advocate
for the petitioner.


Mr. Gurpartap Singh Bhullar, AAG, Punjab.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.285 dated 18.10.2024, registered under Sections 3(5), 115(2), 118(1) BNS (Sections 117(2) and 118(2) BNS added later on), at Police Station Civil Lines, Batala.

2. The FIR was lodged on the statement of Gurpreet Singh, dated 17.10.2024 that the victim/Ramesh Behal, who was riding a motorcycle, was attacked by three unknown persons on 12.10.2024. None of three was named in the FIR. Later, the victim also recorded a statement regarding the incident on 17.10.2024, but did not disclose the petitioner's name who was subsequently involved in the case on the statements of two other eye-witnesses/Simranjit Singh and Parminder Singh recorded on 19.10.2024, alleging that he gave injuries to the victim with a baseball bat.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is a case of false implication which is apparent from the fact that petitioner has been



named after seven days of the incident. The FIR itself was lodged after delay of about five days. Investigation of the case is already complete, and charges have been framed on 04.02.2025. The petitioner is in custody since 19.10.2024.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the facts aforementioned. He contends that there are fourteen prosecution witnesses, who will be examined soon and trial will be concluded. The petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR and does not deserve the benefit of regular bail.

5. Submissions made by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

6. Apparently, none of the witnesses has been examined so far and conclusion of the trial will take some time. Investigation of the case is already over and there is no apprehension of the petitioner tampering with the evidence or threatening the witnesses. Therefore, no useful purpose will be served by confining him to custody during trial.

7. Accordingly, petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

28.04.2025

Ad

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>