



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

226

CRM-M-26120-2025
Date of decision: 22.05.2025

Karanveer Singh alias Karan Dhillon

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present : Mr. J. S. Warring, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. M. S. Toor, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.14 dated 02.02.2025, under Sections 109, 118(2), 126(2), 191(3), 190, 61(2) and 324(4) of BNS, 2023 and later on added Section 118(1) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that petitioner along with his co-accused have given injuries to the complainant. The present petitioner has given Axe (*Kulhari*) blow on the right leg of the complainant. Although, no particular injury attributed was dangerous to life but later an opinion was sought after one month from a private doctor of Sukhmani Hospital, Bathinda, wherein it is stated that collectively all the injuries could be dangerous to life. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is in custody since 10.02.2025 and has undergone a period of 3 months and 7 days as of today. *Challan* has been filed, however, charges are yet to be framed. Prayer has been made for releasing the petitioner on regular bail.



3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in Court which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 7 days.

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

5. In view of the above submission of learned counsel(s), and the fact that petitioner is in custody for 03 months and 7 days as of today; *challan* has been filed but trial is likely to take long time as charges are yet to be framed and the petitioner is not involved in any other case, therefore, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

22.05.2025
anil

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