



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-28479-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 13.11.2025

Ajay Rana @ Khurpa

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Siddarth, Advocate and
Mr. Suraj, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. Ramandeep, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in FIR bearing No.191 dated 15.11.2023, registered under Section(s) 302, 324, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala.

2. Briefly summarized, the case of the prosecution as mentioned in the order dated 22.07.2024 of the trial court reads thus:-

“5. As per facts of case on 14.11.2023 an intimation was received qua Pritam Chand having been brought dead at Rajindra Hospital, Patiala and qua admission of Ajay on account of his having received injuries in a fight. Upon this Inspector Harjinder Singh reached at Rajindra Hospital, Patiala and obtained MLR of Ajay Kumar. On having been



declared fit, he recorded statement of Ajay Kumar who stated that on the said date at about 7:30 PM he was present at his house. In front of their house in the street on Passi Road Ankit, Kirna, Prince and Ajay alias Khurpa were fighting with Jatin, Ishu and Sheetal. Jatin called his brother Deepak on telephone and told that Ankit, Kirna, Prince and Ajay alongwith two other persons were fighting with them without any reason. Upon this, he(complainant) alongwith his father Pritam Chand and younger brother Deepak reached at the spot. They found that Jatin was injured in the fight. When they tried to stop the fight, Ankit gave blow of knife/kirtch with an intention to kill his father Pritam Chand. The blow hit on the thigh of his father. Ajay alias Khurpa gave blow of knife/ kirtch on the private part of his father while Prince gave blow of knife/kirtch on his left arm. Kirna gave blow of brick on the shoulder of his brother Deepak. Two other unknown persons also gave injuries to them. His father fell on the ground. When they raised alarm, the assailants ran away from the spot alongwith their weapons giving threats to them. Pritam Chand was transported to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala where he was declared brought dead. Motive behind the occurrence was that about two months prior complainant party had fight with Ankit and others and due to said grudge they had caused injuries to them and killed Pritam Chand. On the basis of said statement FIR was



208

CRM-M-28479-2025 (O&M)

registered. Accused were arrested.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 18.11.2023 and has undergone custody of nearly 02 years. He submits that out of the total 23 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time in its conclusion. He submits that although the initial version attributed a single injury on the person of the deceased, Pritam Chand, to two individuals, the investigation has since clarified that the fatal thigh injury stands specifically attributed to co-accused Ankit. Insofar as the present petitioner is concerned, he is alleged only to have inflicted a knife injury on the left arm of the complainant, which has been ascertained to be simple in nature. He further contends that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and that the trial is likely to take a long time in its conclusion.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant contends that the earlier petition of the petitioner for grant of regular bail was dismissed on 21.03.2025 and that there is no substantial change of circumstance(s) since then.

6. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition with their able assistance.

7. It is evident that nearly eight months have elapsed since the dismissal of the petitioner's earlier bail application, and during this entire



208 CRM-M-28479-2025 (O&M)

period, the prosecution has not examined even a single witness. Such prolonged inaction on the part of the prosecution, despite the petitioner remaining in custody, constitutes a legitimate ground for the petitioner to seek reconsideration of his prayer for bail.

8. Further, having regard to the fact that the injury attributed to the petitioner is simple in nature, whereas the fatal injury to the deceased stands attributed to co-accused Ankit; the petitioner’s clean antecedents; the circumstance that none of the 23 prosecution witnesses has been examined thus far; and the likelihood that the conclusion of the trial shall take considerable time, I deem it fit to allow the present petition.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

10. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

13.11.2025
Mangal Singh

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