



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

CRM-M-45634-2025

Date of Decision:-26.08.2025

Raghav.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of U.T., Chandigarh.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Dinesh Sharma, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP U.T., Chandigarh.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.50 dated 29.03.2025 under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 109, 191(2), 191(3), 190 added 103 BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Sector 11 (West), Chandigarh.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Arjun Dala and reads as under:-

“ Statement of ARJUN DALAL S/O SURESH KUMAR R/O 1444 SECTOR 20 CHD AGE 19 YEAR, stated that I live with my family at the above mentioned address and I am a student. On dated 28.03.2025 I had gone with my friends Aditya. Abhay and Anirudh to see the MUSICAL CONCERT SHOW being held at UIET CAMPUS, SEC 25 CHD. During this program, Aditya got into an argument with five to six unknown boys who were watching the show there, regarding leaving the show, on which those boys threatened that you have made a mistake by Indulging with us, we



will kill you, due to which our argument with those boys increased and all those boys started abusing due to which the bouncer and security staff present there asked us to leave the show, then we all four friends came out from there and stand outside. It would be around 9.15 PM when all four of us were standing in VENUE GROUND UIET SEC 25 CHD, then the same five-six unknown boys came there armed with knives and sticks etc. in their hands and surrounded us by blocking our way. Those boys started abusing us and started threatening us that you have indulged with us, we will teach you a lesson. In the meantime two boys caught Aditya and one boy attacked Aditya's right side thigh with the knife in his hand and one boy attacked Anirudh on the head with a stick. When we tried to intervene, they attacked us too and during this one boy attacked me with a knife on my back. In this attack, I and my friends got injured. After the attack all those boys fled from there alongwith their weapons, these five-six unknown boys have injured me and my friends by making a murderous attack to whom I can identify if produce before me. legal action should be taken against them, I have given the statemen, in writing, I have heard it, which is correct SD/ ARJUN."

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Even as per the case of the prosecution, he was empty handed and is alleged to have blocked the way. As he is in custody since 30.03.2025 and none of the 15 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned counsel for UT., Chandigarh contends that all the accused assaulted the deceased Aditya and therefore, the allegations levelled against the petitioner do not entitle him to the concession of bail. He however concedes that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner and that he is alleged to have blocked the way.



He also concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 30.03.2025 and that none of the 15 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.
6. Taking the allegations to be correct, the petitioner is stated to have blocked the way of the deceased. His culpability if any shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. He is in custody since 30.03.2025 but none of the 15 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded in the near future. In this situation the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.
7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Raghav** son of Sh. Dinesh is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.
8. If the petitioner or any of his family members/associates make any attempt to contact/threaten/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this Court.
9. The petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioners from trial without sufficient cause.
10. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

August 26, 2025
Vinay

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