



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-52347-2025
Date of decision: 13.02.2026

VISHANT ALIAS KATTY

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF U.T CHANDIGARH

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Vaibhav Bhargav, Advocate and
Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, Addl Public Prosecutor and
Mr. Dixit Bhardwaj, Advocate
for respondent-U.T. Chandigarh.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-37503-2025

Application is allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-52347-2025

1. The instant **first petition** has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 156 dated 31.12.2024, registered under Section(s) 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 118, 109, 103, 333, 351(2) of BNS at Police Station Sector 11 West, Chandigarh.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered at the instance

of Gaurav @ Bharat son of Maan Singh who reported to the Police that nearly 10-15 days ago, he alongwith his maternal uncle Shubham @ Subhi had some altercation with Rohit @ Golu and Deep and they had extended threat to kill him. The complainant had stated that on 30.12.2024, he had gone to his maternal uncle Shubham's house to celebrate the birthday of his daughter Priyanshi where Shubham @ Subhi, Sahil and Sawan @ Goldy were present. It was further stated that thereafter, they all went to the House No. 2461 to celebrate the party and at around 9:30 p.m. Rohit @ Golu, Deep, Binder, Rahul alongwith 2-3 other persons armed with knife, Axe, Sword etc. forcibly entered the house and raised an exhortation to kill. Upon hearing the commotion his maternal uncle Shubham stoop up, whereupon Rohit @ Golu gave knife blows on his chest with an intention to kill him. As a result of the injury, the complainant's uncle Shubham fell down and thereafter the accused persons also assaulted them due to which they sustained injuries. Complainant's uncle-Shubham is stated to have succumbed due to the injury.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor he was present at the spot at the time of occurrence. He was nominated as an accused on the basis of secret information and was arrested on 01.01.2025. He further contends that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner and that the stab injuries are attributed to co-accused Rohit whose bail order already stands rejected by this Court and he is in custody. He further submits that no witness out of 31 witnesses have been examined so far and that the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of one month and 12 days in the present case.

4. The aforesaid facts are not disputed by the Public Prosecutor. He, however, submits that the petitioner was involved in one another case but stands acquitted in the same.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Noticing the aforesaid facts & circumstances and taking into consideration the fatal injury being attributed to co-accused Rohit, the absence of petitioner at the spot, no recovery being effected from him, the period of custody undergone by him coupled with his young age of 20 years and further bearing in mind the stage of trial which is likely to take a long time to conclude, I deem it fit to allow the present petition & enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 13, 2026

Vishal Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No