



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

**CRM-M-52682-2025
Date of Decision: 23.09.2025**

PRINCE Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Rythem Bajaj, 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.19, dated 23.01.2025, registered at Police Station Model Town, Ludhiana, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana under Sections 309(4), 62 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 statement given to the police by Shivam son of Umesh Kumar with the allegations that on 23.01.2025, he alongwith his uncle- Mishri Lal and Vijay Kumar @ Munna were present as usual on their vegetable stall situated near Harkrishan School, Dugri. 04 unknown persons came there, out of whom



02 got down from the vehicle and asked him to show the permission for installing the stall and they claimed themselves to be officials from Municipal Corporation. When they asked them to show their identity cards, they took out their daggers and one of them starting hitting him. He put forward his hand to ward off the blow and the dagger hit on the fingers of his right hand. In the meanwhile, two unknown persons tried to snatch money from him but he caught one of them while his uncle and his son caught hold of the other unknown boy. Thereafter, crowd gathered at the spot and the public gave beatings to them while two persons accompanying them fled away from the spot. On inquiry, they told their names as Rahul and Prince (petitioner). He alleged that both of them had inflicted injuries to him with an intention to extort money from him. Thereafter, PCR also reached there and the accused were handed over to the police.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner is in custody since 23.01.2025 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented on 17.03.2025 and thereafter, trial has not progressed. The trial is likely 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 does not deserve to be released on bail in view of the gravity of the offence committed by the petitioner.

6. The petitioner was apprehended at the spot, after he allegedly tried to snatch money from the victim or indulge in extortion and he had allegedly caused injuries to the victim. Petitioner is in custody



since 23.01.2025 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented on 17.03.2025 and thereafter, trial has not progressed. As such, trial is likely 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.

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

23.09.2025
Ali

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