

2026:PHHC:037997



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.63855 of 2025

Satya Narayan ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	10.03.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	12.03.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	12.03.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Jyotika Behl, Advocate for
Mr. Vinod Pundir, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under
Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short



“BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
113	19.08.2025	Division No.7, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar	109(3) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 (118(1)(2) of BNS was added later on)

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by Dr. Rahul Sood, alleging therein that he was practicing in Kidney Hospital, Jalandhar. On the evening of 19.08.2025, while on his way back to his house from the hospital, he was stopped at the More Super Market Store to buy some household goods. When he came out after buying the same, three persons came behind him. One of them pushed him and made him sit on the back seat of his car. When he resisted, they threatened to shoot him. One of them fired three shots upon him two of which were missed and one hit right leg. Thereafter, they fled away. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On the basis of some secret information, the petitioner along with co-accused Ajit Kumar and Bablu Kumar was nominated as accused. He was arrested on 02.09.2025. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. He was duly identified by the complainant. The CCTV footage of the camera installed in the place of occurrence has also been collected which showed prior commission of act of recce and presence of the petitioner and the co-accused at the spot of occurrence.

2026:PHHC:037997



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. His nomination is only on the basis of hearsay evidence. No test identification parade of the petitioner has been conducted. No case for commission of subject offences has been made out against him. No recovery has been effected at his instance. He is in custody since 02.09.2025. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any more. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Per contra, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab while relying on the status report has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. His complicity in the commission of subject offences stand established. He was seen in the CCTV footage of the place of occurrence and had been duly identified by the complainant. The complainant and other material witnesses are yet to be examined. There are chances of petitioner's intimidating them and committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have made an attempt to kill the complainant by firing shots with some firearm on the fateful day. The allegations prima facie make out a case for commission of subject offences against the petitioner. However, the

petitioner is not required for further investigation now since the same stands

2026:PHHC:037997



concluded. There are no chances of conclusion of trial in near future as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. There is no basis for the contention that he may intimidate the witnesses or will abscond. As such, no fruitful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any more. It is well settled proposition of law that pre trial incarceration should not be a replica of post conviction sentencing and the bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Taking into consideration the clean antecedents of the petitioner, the period spent by him in custody and the circumstances peculiar to the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for release on bail.

7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds as well as surety bonds by two sureties in the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned and on the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case in any manner whatsoever.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not leave the country under any circumstance without permission of the learned trial Court.
- (iii) The petitioner shall appear before each and every date of hearing.
- (iv) The petitioner shall provide his permanent address as



well as present address before the learned trial Court at the time of furnishing of bonds and shall not change the same without informing the trial Court.

(v) The petitioner shall also give copy of his Aadhar Card, PAN Card if any and details of his mobile phone number(s) to the learned trial Court at the time of furnishing of bonds and in case, any change in his mobile phone number takes place, then he shall inform about the same to the learned trial Court in advance and shall keep his mobile phone switch on all times.

(vi) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the learned trial Court.

8. In the eventuality of breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the respondent-State shall be at liberty to move an application seeking cancellation of the bail.

9. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

12.03.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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