

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

2026:PHHC:064148



CRM-M-22091-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 27.04.2026

RAJAN KASHYAP

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Paras Jagga, 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.23 Dated 10.03.2025, registered under Section 109, 115(2), 126(2), 191(3), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and section 118(2) BNS added later on (Corresponding Section 307, 323, 341, 148, 149 of IPC) and Corresponding section 326 IPC added later on, at Police Station Daba, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that petitioner who was armed with datar along with the co-accused have inflicted injuries upon Amandeep Singh @ Ashu and Ajay Pandey. It is further alleged that Amandeep Singh @ Ashu has sustained 34 injuries whereas Ajay Pandey has sustained 05 injuries.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner. The recovery of weapon

from the petitioner is stated to have been effected pursuant to the disclosure statement of the co-accused. The petitioner is in custody in the present case since 20.03.2025 and he is not involved in any other case.

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. However, he does not dispute the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 20.03.2025 and further submits that out of total cited 25 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

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 although petitioner was stated to be armed with *datar*, however, no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner; petitioner is in custody since 20.03.2025; he is not involved in any other case; out of total cited 25 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far; the conclusion of 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.

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

9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.04.2026
Janki

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

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE