



214

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

CRM-M-30979-2026

Date of Decision: 01.07.2026

Amar Pal

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Rajesh K. Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.207 dated 22.10.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 109, 351(3), 3(5), 117(3) of BNS, 2023 (old Sections 323, 325, 307, 506(2), 34 of IPC), at Police Station Division No.1, District Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the FIR (Annexure P-1), no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. Even the petitioner had no motive to cause injuries to the complainant in the present case. Even otherwise, the allegations in the present case were levelled against Rinku, co-accused by the complainant and the petitioner has been unnecessarily dragged in the present case. He further contends that Lakhwinder Singh @ Lucky, injured already stands discharged from the hospital and is hale and hearty. After completion of investigation, challan was presented against the petitioner and his co-accused. He further submits that out of total 12 witnesses,

only 03 witnesses have been examined so far and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time. Even otherwise, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 08 months.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, even though, from a perusal of the FIR, the petitioner has been named in the FIR, but no specific role has been attributed to him. He is stated to be in custody for the last more than 08 months and the prosecution has been able to examine only three witnesses so far. Thus, the trial is not likely to conclude in near future. Apart from that, the injured in the present case admittedly stands discharged from the hospital and there is no material to show that the petitioner may be in a position to tamper with the prosecution evidence. Even otherwise, the petitioner is the first offender and deserves sympathetic consideration by this Court.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

01.07.2026
hemlata

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