



CRM-M-15635-2026

-1-

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

204

CRM-M-15635-2026
Date of Decision: 27.03.2026

JASDEEP KUMAR @ LALLI**... PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**... RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Vipin Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS corresponding Section 439 of Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail in the case FIR No. 0043 dated 13.03.2024 under Sections 323,451,427,148,149 IPC (corresponding Sections 115(2), 332(C), 324(4)/(5), 191(3), 190 BNS) and Sections 325, 308, 302, 201 IPC added later on (Corresponding Sections 117(2), 110, 103, 238 BNS) registered at Police Station Division No.6, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with seven other co-accused, reached the liquor tavern being run by the complainant and created a ruckus. They were armed with *dattars* and inflicted injuries upon Rahul, an employee of the complainant, by delivering a blow on his head with a *dattar*, and also caused damage to other articles lying at the spot.



CRM-M-15635-2026

-2-

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been nominated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Pawan, which is not admissible in evidence against him. He further submits that no specific role or overt act has been attributed to the petitioner. It is contended that the petitioner was a juvenile at the time of the alleged occurrence, is not involved in any other case, and is in custody since 19.01.2025.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rohit Hans, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail on the ground that the petitioner has actively participated in the commission of the offence. It is further submitted that the challan has already been presented and, out of 20 cited prosecution witnesses, only 06 have been examined so far.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions and considering that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 1 month, is not involved in any other case, out of 20 cited prosecution witnesses, only 06 have been examined so far, coupled with the fact that the trial is likely to take considerable time, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served by further incarceration of the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail during the pendency of the trial.



CRM-M-15635-2026

-3-

8. 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/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.
9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
10. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

27.03.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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