



CRM-M-17030-2026

-1-

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

106

CRM-M-17030-2026

Date of decision : 30.03.2026

SACHUN SHARMA ALIAS SACHUL SHARMA

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.. RESPONDENTS

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

Present:- Mr. Anmol Puri, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483(3) BNSS (erstwhile Section 439(2) Cr.P.C.) seeking cancellation of regular bail granted to respondent No.2 vide order dated 27.02.2026 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar in case FIR No.08 dated 08.01.2026, registered under Section 115(2), 110 of BNS (erstwhile Sections 323, 308 IPC) and Sections 25 & 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station City Nawanshahar, District SBS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, submits that the allegations against respondent No.2 are grave in nature and the injury attributed to him is on a vital part of the body. It is further contended that the learned trial Court erred in recording observations regarding the conduct of the complainant party, despite the fact that the entire incident was captured in CCTV footage.

**CRM-M-17030-2026****-2-**

The petitioner also seeks preservation and production of the complete CCTV footage of the alleged occurrence.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the material available on record.

4. It is apparent that respondent No.2 had been granted regular bail by the learned trial Court in the aforesaid FIR vide order dated 27.02.2026 (Annexure P-2) after appreciating the entire evidence including the CCTV footage.

5. It is a settled principle of law that once bail has been granted, it cannot be cancelled in a mechanical manner unless there are strong and compelling reasons such as misuse of the bail concession, interference with the investigation, tampering with evidence, influencing witnesses, or likelihood of the accused absconding.

6. In the present case, the petitioner has failed to place on record any material to show that respondent No.2 has violated any condition of bail or misused the liberty granted to him. The grounds raised by the petitioner mainly relate to the merits of the case, which cannot be reconsidered in a petition for cancellation of bail.

7. In view of the above, this Court does not find any justifiable ground to interfere with the order granting regular bail to respondent No.2.

8. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

9. However, insofar as the prayer regarding preservation and production of CCTV footage is concerned, the same cannot be entertained in



CRM-M-17030-2026

-3-

the present petition for cancellation of bail. The petitioner shall be at liberty to seek recourse to the alternative remedy available to him under with law.

30.03.2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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