



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

242

CRM-M-39509-2025

Date of decision: 30.07.2025

RAVI KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate with
Mr. Aparav Kamboj, Advocate and
Mr. Akash Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Bhargav, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.208 dated 30.11.2021 under Sections 304, 323, 148, 149 of IPC registered at Police Station City Moga.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused has caused injury to the deceased-Kuljit Singh and the said Kuljit Singh was the employee with the shop of the complainant. The incident had taken place as the complainant and the accused are in the same business of tyre shop.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody for more than 01 year and 03 months and out of 36 prosecution



witnesses, 25 witnesses have been given up by the prosecution whereas only 03 witnesses have been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State whereas Memorandum of Appearance on behalf of complainant has been filed in Court which is taken on record.

6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing of custody certificate dated 29.07.2025 and further states that the petitioner has undergone custody period of 01 year, 03 months and 19 days and does not refute the fact that out of 36 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner 01 year, 03 months and 19 days and also the fact that out of 36 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice and also conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.



10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

30th July, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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