



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

CRM-M-51050-2025

Date of Decision: 16.09.2025

RISHAB LUMBA

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Jasjeet Singh Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.74, dated 14.10.2024, registered at Police Station D-Division, District Amritsar (Annexure P-1), under Sections 304(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

3. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by Raman Mahajan with the allegations that on 13.10.2024 at about 8.00 PM, he alongwith his wife was coming from Hall Gate to Lahori Gate. However, he arranged an auto-rickshaw for his wife at Hall Gate for going home and when the auto-rickshaw reached



near Beri Gate two young boys came from behind on a motorcycle and snatched her mobile phone make Oppo and escaped from the spot. During investigation, accused Rishab Lumba and Suraj Kumar were arrested in the present case and the snatched mobile phone was recovered from the possession of accused Rishab Lumba and after completion of investigation, final report has been presented.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The offence in question was committed by unknown persons whose physical features, age, complexion and built were also not mentioned in the FIR. No test identification parade of the accused has been got conducted. Petitioner is in custody since 03.02.2025. The offence in question is a Magisterial trial and the decision of the case is certainly going to take sufficiently long time to conclude and in these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and he deserves to be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner is involved in one more case of similar nature and since he is a habitual offender, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. Petitioner is in custody since 03.02.2025. Investigation has already been completed and final report has been presented. The offence in question is a Magisterial trial. The trial is certainly going to take sufficiently long time to conclude. The co-accused namely Suraj Kumar has already been granted concession of bail by the Court of Ld. Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide order dated 26.05.2025 (Annexure P-3) and in these circumstances, further detention of the



petitioner is not required and he deserves to be released on bail.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

16.09.2025
Ali

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