



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

134

CRM-M-57633-2025
Decided on : 24.02.2026

Rohan Gill @ Bau . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jitender Singh Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant third petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rohan Gill @ Bau	113	17.06.2025	109, 112(2), 125(A), 125(B), 221, 281, 324(4) of BNS, 2023 [S. 341(2) of BNS, 2023 & 25, 27, 54 of Arms Act, 1959, added later on]	Salem Tabri	Ludhiana

2. Instant FIR has been got registered by Inspector Harpreet Singh, while posted as SHO of the concerned police station, stating therein that on 17.06.2025, in order to arrest accused – Love Gill in case FIR No. 37 dated 04.05.2025, under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Division No.04, Ludhiana, he was being chased in his car bearing registration No. HR-26FF-5339. The said car was



occupied by three persons. After making efforts, the car was stopped and the accused persons were apprehended and taken into custody.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that after a period of 18 days from the registration of the FIR, a supplementary statement of the SHO/police official was recorded, wherein it was stated that Rohan Gill @ Bau (petitioner herein), being the real brother of the main accused – Love Gill, was driving the car at the time when it was being chased. Thus, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated subsequently and the story put forth by the prosecution is improbable and not believable.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner had managed to flee from the spot when the car was intercepted, whereas his co-accused Love Gill was apprehended at the spot.

5. I have considered the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant record.

6. Admittedly, name of the petitioner does not find mention in the initial FIR, though his co-accused, who happens to be his real brother, namely, Love Gill, was apprehended at the spot. Whether the petitioner was present in the said vehicle or not, is a matter to be determined by the trial Court after due appreciation of evidence available before it.

It is further noticed that the petitioner is inside jail for the last more than a period of 07 months and 13 days, and the process of recording of statements of the prosecution witnesses has not yet commenced. Besides, no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner regarding causing any injury to the police officials, and the allegations of firing, though without



causing any injury, are primarily attributed to the co-accused Love Gill.

7. Therefore, in view of the totality of the circumstances, and without commenting upon the merits of the case lest it may prejudice either side during trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

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.

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

9. 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.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 24, 2026

J.Ram

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