

CRM-M-9950-2026

2026:PHHC:033461



146
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-9950-2026

Raman Kumar
....Petitioner
versus
State of Punjab
....Respondent

Date of Decision: March 05, 2026
Date of Uploading: March 05, 2026

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Devansh Khanna, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) for grant of regular bail to
the petitioner, in case bearing FIR No.293 dated 12.09.2020, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 302, 323, 324 and 34 of IPC, at Police
Station Basti Bawa Khel, Jalandhar.

2. The gravamen of FIR in question is that on 12.09.2020,
complainant, Roshni, got an FIR registered stating that on said day at about
04:00–04:30 PM, she along with Sunny (son of her paternal aunt) had gone to
the market to purchase domestic articles. When they reached near Mand Palace,
they saw Ravi Kumar, his brother, and some other unknown persons assaulting
Gara Ram, the father of the complainant. During the occurrence, Ravi Kumar

CRM-M-9950-2026

inflicted a knife blow on the chest of Gara Ram, as a result of which he fell to the ground and blood started oozing from his body. Upon this, the complainant and others raised an alarm, which attracted several people to the spot, whereupon the accused fled from the scene.

During the trial, an application moved by the prosecution under Section 319 of the Cr.P.C. was allowed vide order dated 24.07.2023, whereby Raman Kumar (*petitioner herein*) and Anil Kumar were summoned as additional accused in the case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 29.08.2024. Learned counsel has further submitted that no culpability was found *qua* the petitioner by the police during the course of investigation and the petitioner came to be summoned, as an additional accused later on, vide order dated 24.07.2023 passed by the concerned trial court while exercising powers under Section 319 of the Cr. P.C. Learned counsel has further submitted that main accused, namely, Ravi Kumar already stands granted concession of regular bail, vide order dated 18.02.2026 passed by this Court in **CRM-M-6047-2026**. Learned counsel has iterated that the trial is procrastinating and the folly thereof is not attributable to the petitioner. Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner is in custody for more than 01 year. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

CRM-M-9950-2026

6. It is not in dispute before me that the police had not found culpability *qua* the petitioner while presenting the challan, but lateron, the petitioner came to be summoned, as an additional accused, on the basis of a trial Court order dated 24.07.2023 passed under Section 319 of the Cr. P.C. It is further not in dispute before this Court that main accused, namely, Ravi Kumar stands extended concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 18.02.2026. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, if not required in any other case, on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.

CRM-M-9950-2026

- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
 - (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
 - (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.
8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.
9. Ordered accordingly.
10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

March 05, 2026
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No