

2026.PHHC.042108



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

117

CRM-M-66630-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.03.2026

Veeru @ Veeru Raj

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. BS Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.77 dated 11.05.2024, registered under Sections 323, 452, 148, 149, 506 IPC (Sections 325, 308 IPC added later on), at Police Station City South Moga, District Moga.
2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 1 year, 1 month and 11 days. As per the allegations, he gave a blow on the back and legs of Vansh. He underwent DJ stent Placement for Right Sided Ureteric Calculi under Spinal Anesthesia on 16.10.2025 and granted interim bail from 22.09.2025 to 17.11.2025 for the said purpose whereafter he surrendered and had not misused the same, a fact which has been confirmed by the Medical Officer, Jail Hospital, Faridkot dated 17.03.2026, Annexure R/T-1 and Annexures 1 and 2 appended therewith, as per which, he was referred to higher centers as and when required. Challan has been presented on 15.01.2025, charges have been framed on 09.10.2025 and none, out of 15 PWs, has been examined. He is involved in five more cases, 2 of which are under NDPS Act, wherein he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having caused injuries while being part of unlawful assembly. He, however, is unable to controvert with regard to custody, stage, petitioner being on bail in two cases, never misused the concession of bail and particularly with regard to his medical condition.

4. Heard.

5. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc." Reiterating in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, "The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail."

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for last 1 year, 1 month and 11 days; on bail in two cases; never misused the concession of bail earlier granted; challan was presented on 15.01.2025, charges stands framed on 09.10.2025 and out of 15 PWs, none has yet been examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.

- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

ashok

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