

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

212

2025:PHHC:166615



**CRM-M-19384-2025 (O&M)**  
**Date of decision: 01.12.2025.**

**SURAJ ALIAS CHUCHA**

**...Petitioner(s)**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

**...Respondent(s)**

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

Present :- Mr. Vikrant K. Vij, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

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

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.31 dated 04.02.2021, under Section(s) 379-B(2), 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 411 and 201 of the IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

2 The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by the complainant, Bhupinder Singh. He alleged that on 20.01.2021, at about 10:30 p.m., he, along with his cousin Shamsher Singh,

was returning home on a bicycle after visiting their uncle. When they reached near Pippal Wala Shivala, three persons arrived on a motorcycle and surrounded them. The pillion rider took out a knife and threatened them and demanded that they hand over their belongings. Upon the complainant and his cousin resisting, they were pushed to the ground, causing injuries to the complainant. Thereafter, the other two assailants alighted from the motorcycle and forcibly snatched the complainant's mobile phone and a sum of ₹10,000/- . When Shamsheer Singh attempted to intervene, the accused persons assaulted him as well before fleeing from the spot.

3            Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 17.07.2021 and despite expiry of 04 years and 04 months, only two prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. He further contends that the attribution against the petitioner was to the effect that he snatched the mobile phone of the complainant on knife point, however, recovery of the said mobile phone has been effected from the co-accused to whom the concession of regular bail has already been granted. He also contends that taking into consideration the delay in conclusion of the trial and the length of custody of the petitioner, concession of regular bail be extended to him.

4            On the other hand, State counsel submits that the petitioner is the individual against whom allegations of snatching a mobile phone at knife-point have been levelled. It is further pointed out that the petitioner stands implicated in two other cases registered under the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985. He, however, is not in a position to dispute that the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody for a period

of 04 years and 04 months and that only two witnesses out of 12 witnesses cited by prosecution have been examined so far.

5            Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the fact that the co-accused has been granted the concession of bail by the trial Court as well as the stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

6            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.

7            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.

December 01, 2025.  
raj arora

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

: Yes/No

: Yes/No