



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

111+227

CRM-M-32848-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 15.09.2025

Rahul . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Abhishek Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab and
Mr. Bareen Pratap Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

CRM-37082-2025

- I. This is an application filed u/s 528 of BNSS, 2023, for placing on record the judgment of acquittal as Annexure P-3.
- II. Allowed as prayed for. Judgment of acquittal filed along with application as Annexure P-3, is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.
- III. CRM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-32848-2025

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rahul	255	31.12.2024	115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 324(4), 333, 351(2), 191(3),	Division No.6	Police Commissionerate



		190 of BNS, 2023	District Ludhiana
--	--	------------------	-------------------

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, as per FIR, no specific injury was attributed to the petitioner; however, subsequently, the role assigned to him is of giving kick blows on the abdomen of the complainant’s daughter.

3. Learned counsel further submits that even this role remains unconfirmed, as no medical examination of Simran Kaur, the complainant’s daughter, was conducted. Counsel also points out that except for the allegation of kick blows, no other role has been attributed to the petitioner. The allegation of kick blows on the abdomen of the complainant’s daughter, as confirmed in the status report, stands uncorroborated by medical evidence. Petitioner is stated to be unarmed and has not caused any injury to any of the injured.

By referring to paragraph No.12 of the status report, learned counsel also argues that though the final report has already been submitted, out of a total of 18 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined and even charges are yet to be framed. Thus, he prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while relying upon the status report, submits that the only role assigned to the petitioner is of giving kick blows on the abdomen of the complainant’s daughter, and no other specific role has surfaced vis-à-vis the petitioner during the course of investigation.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.



6. There are a total of 20 accused and all the offences are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate. The process of recording prosecution evidence is likely to take considerable time. The petitioner, who is in custody since 22.03.2025, cannot be kept detained for an indefinite period.

7. It is also noticeable that no other case is pending against the petitioner, except one, i.e., FIR No.272, dated 30.10.2020, under Sections 324, 341, 506, 148, 149 of IPC, 1860, registered at P.S. Division No.6, District Ludhiana. In that case also, petitioner has already been acquitted of the charges framed against him for lack of evidence, by the learned trial Court vide judgment dated 29.01.2024, passed by learned JMIC, Ludhiana (Annexure P-3). Therefore, considering the totality of circumstances, the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed above, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, the present petition is **allowed**. The 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/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in



accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 15, 2025
J.Ram

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