



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

216

**CRM-M-16709-2025
Decided on : 02.04.2025**

Raghav Kapoor

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Naveen Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.80 dated 06.07.2024, under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of BNSS, registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that present FIR has been registered only on the basis of secret information. Initially, there were three accused and subsequently, seven more accused were involved in the case. The main accused are; (i) Pawandeep singh @ Mantri, (ii) Shamsheer Singh, (iii) Gurmit Singh. Counsel submits name of present petitioner surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused namely Pawandeep Singh @ Mantri and Shamsheer Singh, who have already been granted the concension of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 17.01.2025 and 23.01.2025. The bail orders of co-accused are also appended with the present petition as Annexures P-2 to P-4. Counsel further informs that investigation has already been completed in the present case and final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C., has been submitted, however, charges are



CRM-M-16709-2025

- 2 -

yet to be framed. Thus, process of recording evidence and culmination of trial would likely to take considerable time.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner. However, he does not dispute the factual position addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, as recorded here-above and also the fact that trial in the case is yet to begin, as charges have not been framed so far.

Besides, the learned State counsel also verifies that the petitioner is not involved in any other case of a similar nature.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant record available on the case file.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also the factum of petitioner being inside jail since 18.11.2024 and further custody of the petitioner is not of any use for the prosecution, as also the fact that he is not involved in any other case of similar nature, I deem it appropriate to entertain the petitioner's plea for regular bail.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected



CRM-M-16709-2025

- 3 -

to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 02, 2025
Rashmi

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