

219 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:057179



CRM-M-19042-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 16.04.2026

DEEPAK ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Roma, Advocate with
Mr. Mohit Vashishat, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (439 Cr.P.C.) in FIR No.155 dated 08.07.2025 under Sections 309(6) (394 IPC) and 3(5) of BNS (34 IPC) (later on deleted) and Sections 317(2), 311 and 310 (2) of BNS added later on (411, 397, 395 IPC) registered at Police Station, Division No.6, District Ludhiana.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with his co-accused, inflicted injuries upon the complainant and his brother-in-law by using a sword, a bicycle and its handle. It is further alleged that petitioner and his co-accused had forcibly robbed the complainant and his brother-in-law of their motorcycle, mobile phones, wallets, Aadhaar card and an amount of ₹15,000/-.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner has no connection with the alleged incident, as the FIR was lodged against unknown persons. The petitioner is in custody for the last 08 months and 20 days and is not involved in any other case. He prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.
4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rohit Hans, D.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. He further submits that as per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 08 months and 20 days.

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

7. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that the petitioner was not named in the FIR; he is not involved in any other case; the petitioner is in custody for the last 08 months and 20 days; the trial is likely to take a long time and 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. Moreover, '*bail is rule and jail is exception*'.

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 bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

16.04.2026

Janki

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