



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

213

CRM-M-54035-2024

Date of decision: 29.09.2025

Raveen Kumar @ Gulli

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Rajesh K. Dadwal, for the petitioner.

Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (old Section 439 Cr.P.C.), in case FIR No.110 dated 14.05.2024, under Sections 302, 452, 148, 149 IPC and later on added offence under Section 201, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Model Town, Hoshiarpur.

2. The case of the prosecution is that Kiran, the sister of the main accused Harry, was having an affair with the deceased Rahul Gill. On that account, the petitioner, along with Lavish son of Ashok Kumar Shoki, Aelis son of Sonu, and Honey @ Billa son of Billa Coch, allegedly arrived on a two-wheeler from the direction of Government College and inflicted injuries upon Rahul Gill. Thereafter the victim was shifted to the hospital, where he was declared dead during the course of treatment. The complainant submits that Kiran is an eye-witness, as she was present at the place of occurrence.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that although the petitioner has been named in the FIR, during the course of investigation



his presence was not established, as the CCTV footage obtained during investigation revealed that he was not present at the time of occurrence. It is thereafter, in a supplementary statement made by the complainant, that the petitioner was named in the FIR as a conspirator. Even the eye-witness, Kiran, in her statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. before the police, has not named the petitioner either as having caused any injuries or as being present at the spot. It is further submitted that out of 20 cited prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined so far, and the petitioner has remained in custody for the last 01 year, 04 months and 02 days as an undertrial. Learned counsel contends that since the trial is yet to commence, the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, and therefore, the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed custody certificate of the petitioner in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 04 months and 02 days. He is involved in several other cases.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that out of 20 witnesses, only 1 has been examined, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.



7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

29.09.2025
anil

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