



CRM-M-19490-2025

1

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

232

**CRM-M-19490-2025
Decided on :19.05.2025**

CHAKSHIT SACHDEVA

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Gurnoor Singh Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.122 dated 03.11.2024, under Sections 103(1), 109 of BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 238, 3(5) of BNS were added later on and Sections 190 and 191(3) of BNS were deleted), registered at Police Station Division No.3, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the allegations in the FIR, no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner, although he is alleged to have been armed with a sickle. It is further submitted that, apart from being named as a member of an unlawful assembly, no overt act has been alleged against the petitioner. Learned counsel points out that five of the named co-accused in FIR namely, (i) Nannu Kapoor, (ii) Dr. Kohli @ Lavish Kohli, (iii) Manav, (iv) Gangi, and (v) Kaka Chaha—have already been found innocent by the police and have not been charge-sheeted.



3. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner's individual role remains uncertain, and no specific motive has been attributed to him. Referring to the impugned order by which the prayer for bail was dismissed by the learned Sessions Court, counsel submits that even in the said order, no specific role of the petitioner in the commission of murder or in causing injuries to the injured persons has been discussed.

It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for the last six months and seven days. The investigation in the matter has been completed, and the trial is yet to commence, with the process of recording the statements of witnesses still pending. The petitioner is stated to have clean antecedents and is not involved in any other case of a similar nature.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has placed on record a status report by way of an affidavit of Sh. Aatish Bhatia, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police (North), Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar, filed on behalf of the respondent/State. The same is taken on record, and the Registry is directed to tag the said affidavit at the appropriate place in the paper-book.

Learned State counsel opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, submitting that the allegations against him are serious in nature. It is contended that the petitioner was part of an unlawful assembly that resulted in the brutal murder of an individual, and he was specifically named in the FIR as being armed with a deadly weapon



CRM-M-19490-2025

3

(sickle), indicating a potential role in the commission of the offence. The presence of the petitioner at the scene, armed and aligned with the assailants, reflects a shared common intention, and his release at this stage may hamper the ongoing trial and there is possibility of the petitioner influencing witnesses or tampering with evidence, therefore prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Having considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, and taking into account the fact that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner, coupled with the fact that he has no other criminal case registered against him, and considering his age (27 years), his continued custody for the past six months, and the fact that the investigation has been completed while the trial is yet to begin, it appears that the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time.

In view of the foregoing, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves an opportunity to rehabilitate and reintegrate into society, especially since the present case is the only one in which he is facing trial.

6. Considering the aspects and circumstances, 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 the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

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



CRM-M-19490-2025

4

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

8. It is further made clear that if in future petitioner is found indulged in similar kind of activities, prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in the present case.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

19.05.2025

Rashmi

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