



260

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

CRM-M-26652-2025

Date of Decision: 20.05.2025

ROHIT MASIH ALIAS GOLU

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. Harvinder Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Gobind Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, Deputy, A.G., Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.076 dated 14.12.2024, registered under Sections 333, 118(1), 118(2), 115(2), 190, 191(3), 351(2), 351(3) BNS of 2023 (Section 109 BNS of 2023 added later on) Police Station Ghane Ke Bangar, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the allegations levelled by the petitioner, the petitioner was allegedly armed with a *datar* and caused injuries on the head and elbow of the complainant, Somail Masih. He further contends that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Further, a cross version was also recorded against the complainant party and several persons on the side of the petitioner had also suffered injuries in the incident. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 20.03.2025



and the investigation is almost complete against him. He further contends that Dalbara Masih @ Bara Masih and one more co-accused have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 10.03.2025 (Annexure P-3). Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had caused serious injuries to the complainant in the present case and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. He further submits that one more case was also registered against him, however, he is on bail in the said case.

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

5. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last more than 02 months in the present case. Moreover, it is a case of version and cross version and the question of aggressor is yet to be decided by the trial Court. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

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

20.05.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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