



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

**CRM-M-21912-2025**

**Date of Decision:30.04.2025**

Aman Kumar

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**

**Present :** Mr. Balkaran Singh Aulakh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepinder Singh Brar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No. 174, dated 15.11.2024, registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 191(3), 190, 351(3) of B.N.S and 109 of B.N.S added later on, Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the version of the prosecution is highly improbable and unbelievable. It has been alleged that the petitioner had allegedly given several blows with “Toka” on the head of the brother of the complainant, however, Rohit had suffered only one injury on his forehead and that injury was apparently suffered due to some blunt weapon. Except that all other injuries suffered by Rohit were simple in nature and the offence under Section 109 of B.N.S has been wrongly added in the present case. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 31.01.2025 and after

completion of the investigation challan has already been presented against him. He further contends that the petitioner was not involved in any other case and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, Rohit had suffered one injury on his forehead, which has already been declared to be dangerous to life, however, the injured has already been discharged long ago. The police has presented the challan against the petitioner and no witness has been examined so far. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

**(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

30.04.2024  
hitesh

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |