



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-48669-2025
Decided on : 05.09.2025

ROHIT SHARMA @ NANNUPETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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
Rohit Sharma @ Nannu	41	27.02.2025	105 of BNS	Dugri	Ludhiana

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner has not been named in the FIR and even if the allegations are taken at face value, the deceased – Sahil Hans – died due to an overdose of narcotic drugs or because of his ill health. By referring to the contents of the FIR, learned counsel submits that the case was registered at the instance of his wife – Jassimran Kaur – stating that her husband (deceased – Sahil Hans) had been



addicted to drugs for the last 7–8 years. He had also undergone treatment at the De-addiction Centre, Kup Kalan, Malerkotla. After returning from there, he was seen in the company of co-accused -namely Tarun Kumar @ Mota in the days leading up to his death. On the day of the incident, i.e., 26.02.2025, the deceased was last seen with the co-accused until about 6:00 P.M., and he died at his own residence around 11:00 P.M. Before his death, he had gone to the bathroom, where he vomited and fell down.

3. Learned counsel further argues that the circumstances narrated in the FIR do not disclose name of the petitioner. Even, the offence under Section 105 of the BNS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 304 IPC), is not clearly made out and same would be a moot question before the trial Court. Besides, petitioner is inside since 11.04.2025. Therefore, learned counsel prays for the grant of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, does not dispute the factual aspects as noticed above, including the duration of incarceration and the fact that no prosecution witness has been examined so far.

5. I have considered the rival submissions and perused the material on record.

It is noticed that one of the co-accused namely Tarun Kumar @ Mota whose name is mentioned in the FIR, has been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 05.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-40149-2025. Further, investigation has already been completed and challan has been filed. However, the process of recording of statements of the prosecution witnesses is yet to start. Besides, the question as to whether the offence under Section 105 of the BNS, 2023, is made out or not, is a matter for adjudication during the trial. Therefore, personal liberty of the petitioner



cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period. Accordingly, in the totality of the circumstances, this Court finds it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. 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/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

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

7. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

05.09.2025

pry

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**

Whether Reportable: **~~YES~~/NO**