



CRM-M-29875-2026

1

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

209

**CRM-M-29875-2026
Decided on : 29.05.2026**

Amit Kumar**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 13 dated 16.01.2024, under Sections 302, 34, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar (Rural).

2. Deceased in the present case is Manav, son of the complainant and eye-witness, namely Renu. Incident occurred on 15.01.2024 at around 5:00 P.M. As per the eye-witness account, Hardeep Kumar was riding a motorcycle with Prince Mattu @ Rajju seated behind him, while on a second motorcycle, Amit Kumar (petitioner herein) was driving with Manav riding as a pillion passenger. When they reached near the Government Primary School in Village Bharsinghpura, they were intercepted by two individuals riding a rickshaw cart loaded with fodder. The said persons deliberately stopped both the motorcycles by obstructing the road with the rickshaw cart. Thereafter, two unknown



individuals attacked on all four persons, namely Hardeep Kumar, Amit Kumar(petitioner herein), Prince @ Rajju, and Manav (deceased in this case). During the assault, one of the assailants attempted to inflict a knife blow on petitioner. As Hardeep Kumar began to run in order to save himself, Manav (deceased) followed him in an attempt to rescue him. In the course of scuffle, Manav sustained knife injuries to his stomach, which ultimately led to his death. In the concluding part of the FIR, complainant, Renu, expressed suspicion against the friends of the deceased, namely Hardeep Kumar, Amit Kumar(petitioner herein), and Prince Mattu @ Rajju , alleging that the incident was not accidental but rather a pre-planned act of murder, carried out as part of a conspiracy to take revenge arising from an old enmity involving Jasvir Kumar and Pawan Kumar.

3. Counsel for the petitioner argues that a procured eye-witness has been planted in the present case to fabricate allegations against the petitioner and other co-accused for the murder of the deceased, Manav, who, in fact, was killed by some unknown persons. Prosecution has not even appended any medico-legal report along with the *challan* or final report regarding injuries, if any, suffered by co-accused Hardeep Kumar and Amit Kumar (petitioner herein) or Prince Mattu @ Rajju.

Further, it is submitted that even if the FIR version is accepted at this stage, no active role is attributed to the petitioner in causing any injury to the deceased. As per the FIR, the actual accused, Jasvir Singh, who caused the knife blow, has been arrested and is currently in jail. Moreover, FIR states that the complainant, Renu, was



accompanying her nephew, Prince, son of Parshottam, on a motorcycle; however, no explanation is provided in the FIR regarding the registration numbers of the motorcycles driven by Hardeep Kumar, Amit Kumar (petitioner herein), or even the complainant's nephew, Prince.

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the eye-witnesses, i.e. complainant Renu (mother of the deceased) and Prince, son of Parshottam, were examined in chief in April, 2025, but have not come forward for cross-examination, causing delay in the trial and forcing the petitioner to remain in jail. Thus, counsel for the petitioner contends that FIR version appears highly doubtful and full of improbabilities. Learned Counsel for the petitioner also submits that co-accused namely, Prince Mattu alias Rajju and Hardeep Kumar have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 08.10.2025(P-7) and 19.03.2026(P-8) passed in CRM-M-60357-2024 and CRM-M-41188-2025 respectively. Counsel contends that petitioner is in custody since 16.01.2024 and no meaningful purpose would be served by keeping him in jail for an indefinite period. Therefore, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer made by the petitioner, submits that petitioner has played an active role in the present case, as he is specifically named in the FIR. However, learned State counsel is unable to dispute the total period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, as well as the other factual aspects raised by the petitioner's counsel during the course of arguments before this Court. Nonetheless, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.



6. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available on file.

7. It is noticed that prosecution has not appended any medico-legal report along with the challan or final report in respect of any injuries allegedly sustained by petitioner, Hardeep Kumar, or Prince Mattu @ Rajju. Furthermore, the key eye-witnesses, namely complainant-Renu (mother of the deceased) and Prince, son of Parshottam, were examined in chief in April 2025 but have failed to appear for cross-examination, thereby causing undue delay in the trial proceedings. Moreover, co-accused, namely Prince Mattu @ Rajju and Hardeep Kumar have already been granted bail, and petitioner is in custody since 16.01.2024. In these circumstances, continued detention of the petitioner would not serve any meaningful purpose.

8. In view of the totality of circumstances, nature of allegations against the petitioner, and the factors discussed hereinabove, this Court finds it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner in the present case.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

**CRM-M-29875-2026****5**

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

29.05.2026

Rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: ✓YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: ✓YES/~~NO~~