



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRR-1548-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 23.06.2026

Karan Khosla

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Amit Shukla, DAG, Punjab.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

Prayer in the present revision petition is for setting-aside the order dated 18.05.2026 passed by the learned Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Amritsar, vide which the application moved by the petitioner for the grant of bail in case FIR No.258 dated 01.12.2024 under Section 103(1) BNS (Sections 238 and 3(5) BNS added subsequently) (corresponding Sections 302, 201 and 34 IPC) registered at Police Station Islamabad, District Amritsar, has been dismissed. Further, a prayer has been made to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the said FIR.

2. The allegation is that the petitioner, along with other accused committed the murder of one Aniket (son of the complainant), leading to the registration of the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been submitted that the petitioner has been named in the present case on the basis of alleged extra judicial confession of the petitioner and co-accused before one Paramjit Singh, who was not known to the co-accused. Hence, there was no occasion for the co-accused to have made any extra judicial confession

before him. He further submitted that as per the social investigation report, this is the first offence of the petitioner because of peer group influence and the mother of the petitioner had undertaken that the petitioner would not come into contact with bad elements and would remain under their strict watch. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case and no recovery is to be effected from him. The petitioner is in protective custody since 02.12.2024. He further submitted that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Learned counsel further submits that co-accused Rudar Gill alias Lucky against whom same allegations were levelled, has already granted bail vide order dated 05.05.2026 passed in CRR-369-2026 (Annexure P-2). On a query by the Court, learned counsel states that the petitioner has not been ordered to be tried as an adult.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He further submitted that the petitioner was actively involved in the crime as he was a part of the unlawful assembly which committed murder of Aniket. However, learned State counsel could not controvert the fact that the petitioner is a juvenile, the factum of the custody of the petitioner and that he has clean antecedents as also that co-accused Rudar Gill alias Lucky, whose case is at par with the petitioner, has been granted regular bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. The petitioner is admittedly a juvenile and is stated to have clean antecedents. No other case is shown to have been registered against him. His implication in the present case appears to be primarily based on the extra-judicial confession suffered by a co-accused, the evidentiary value of which shall be tested during trial. The petitioner is in protective custody since

02.12.2024 and as per the social investigation report, this is his first offence, allegedly influenced by peer association. The mother of the petitioner has undertaken to keep him under strict supervision and to ensure that he does not come into contact with undesirable elements. Moreover, the State has not been able to controvert the petitioner's juvenile status and clean antecedents. The culpability, if any, would be determined at the time of the trial, which is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Still further, co-accused Rudar Gill @ Lucky has been released on regular bail, the petitioner has also not been ordered to be tried as an adult. Under the circumstance, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further custody.

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Amritsar. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed to be an expression on the merits of the case.

Application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

June 23, 2026

vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No