



CRM-M-39963-2025

1

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

115

CRM-M-39963-2025

Decided on :21.04.2026

Ashish Singh @ Ashish

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in connection with FIR No. 16 dated 14.02.2025, under Sections 309(4), 3(5) of BNS (Section 309(6), 317(2) of BNS were added lateron), registered at Police Station Sadar, Amritsar.

2. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, following was recorded on 27.11.2025:

“i) As per the prosecution, on February 13, 2025, at approximately 9:45 PM, the complainant, Amandeep, was riding his motorcycle (PB02-BT-2771, Splendor Pro) with his friend Akash near Heera Market, 88 Feet Road, Amritsar, when they were hit from behind by a motorcycle carrying four youths. As a result of the collision, both parties fell to the ground. The four youths then began abusing Amandeep and Akash, and one of them struck Amandeep on the left arm near the shoulder with a dattar, followed by blows to his waist and back from the reverse side of the dattar. Amandeep’s motorcycle was also snatched, and the accused fled the scene. Amandeep’s



CRM-M-39963-2025

2

statement was recorded by the police on the following day, February 14, 2025.

ii) Counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner's name does not appear in the FIR and that he has been implicated solely on the basis of a disclosure statement made by the already-arrested co-accused, Sukhdev Singh. Counsel further submits that there was a delay of one day in registering the FIR, as the alleged incident occurred on February 13, 2025, but the FIR was registered on February 14, 2025. Counsel also submits that petitioner is in custody since February 15, 2025.

iii) Court is informed that charges are yet to be framed on 10.12.2025.

iv) List on 15.12.2025.

v) Learned trial Court and the prosecution agency are directed to record the statement of injured/complainant-Amandeep, at the first instance.

vi) Let a copy of this order be forwarded immediately to the learned trial court concerned for necessary information and compliance.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the statement of the injured witness, Amandeep, was recorded before the learned trial Court on 09.12.2025. During the course of his examination, he clearly stated that “today he has not seen the accused in the Court.” A copy of the said statement has been filed in Court today.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner is in custody for more than one year and two months. The material injured witness has already been examined; therefore, there is no

**CRM-M-39963-2025****3**

likelihood of petitioner tampering with or influencing the witness(es). Moreover, petitioner has clean antecedents, as no other case is registered against him.

In view of the above, it is prayed that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail

4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the grant of regular bail to the petitioner, submitting that the allegations against him are serious in nature and supported by the material available on record. It is contended that petitioner's release at this stage may adversely affect the fair conduct of the trial. Accordingly, in view of the gravity of the offence and the overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is prayed that present petition be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book as well as the documents appended thereto.

6. Considering the fact that the statement of the injured witness has already been recorded before the learned trial Court, petitioner is in custody for a period of more than one year and two months, and there is nothing on record to prove that he has any criminal antecedents, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further incarceration. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, petitioner is held entitled to the concession of regular bail.

**CRM-M-39963-2025****4**

Consequently, 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.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, 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.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

21.04.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No