



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

222+224

CRM-M-31104-2025(O&M)
Decided on : 26.08.2025

1.
NANU GUPTA
VS
STATE OF PUNJAB

....Petitioner(s)

...Respondent(s)

CRM-M-32736-2025 (O&M)

2.

ANMOL ARORA @ BONY
Vs.
STATE OF PUNJAB

....Petitioner(s)

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jasman Singh Gill, Advocate &
Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-31104-2025 & CRM-M-32736-2025, as both the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-31104-2025.

2. The aforementioned petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have 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
Nanu Gupta (petitioner in	10	15.01.2025	103, 3(5), 61(2) of BNS, 2023	Haibowal, Ludhiana	Ludhiana



CRM-M-31104-2025)					
Anmol Arora @ Bony (petitioner in CRM-M-32736-2025)					

3. Petitioner - Nanu Gupta, is father of the main accused Sonu Gupta, and except of general and vague allegation that he was present on the spot no active role in any manner has been attributed against the petitioners.

4. Further submits that main role is attributed to accused Sonu, who threw the brick which caused injury, and thereupon, resulted into the death of Gurmail Singh (father of the complainant). Admittedly, none of the accused was armed with deadly weapons, rather, a brick has been thrown, which in fact, might be already lying on the spot. Therefore, it would be a moot question before the trial Court at the time of its final decision, whether the offence in the present case is actually of causing murder, or culpable homicide not amounting to murder.

5. Counsel for the both the petitioners (in both cases) further submits that the petitioners have been in custody for last 07 months 07 days.

It is also submitted that petitioners have no prior involvement in any similar incidents, and no specific role has been attributed to them in the present case. Their alleged complicity in the crime is yet to be determined through proper investigation and trial. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

On being asked by the Court, counsel for the petitioner submits that, despite presentation of the challan, none of the prosecution witnesses



has been examined, till date. This indicates that the trial is progressing at a slow pace and its culmination is likely to take a considerable amount of time.

6. On advance notice, Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent/State, and submits that Sonu Gupta, who is the main accused, is son of the petitioner Nanu Gupta, who is yet to be arrested.

It is further submitted that presence of the petitioner at the scene of the incident is evident from the version mentioned in the FIR itself. Therefore, at this stage, it cannot be conclusively presumed that petitioner is entirely innocent, or they did not conspire with the other co-accused in the commission of the offence. Thus, prays for dismissal of the petitioner's request for regular bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record, this Court finds that the roles attributed to the petitioners are of a general nature. The main injury, which led to the unfortunate death of the complainant's father, is specifically attributed to co-accused Sonu Gupta. It is also not in dispute that the petitioners have been in custody for more than seven months and that, despite presentation of the challan, none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined till date, indicating that the trial is likely to take considerable time. Petitioners are not shown to be involved in any other criminal case, and no recovery is effected from them. In these circumstances, without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that further detention of the petitioners is not warranted and they are entitled to the concession of regular bail



8. Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**.
Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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.

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

10. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as
an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is
expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on
record.

11. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioners are directly
found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be
cancelled.

Petitions stand disposed of.

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

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected
case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

August 26, 2025

Deepak Patwal

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