



CRM-M-11053-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-11053-2025
Decided on : 17.09.2025

ANIKET ALIAS ANKIT ALIAS DHILLU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. A.S. Manaise, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant 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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Aniket @ Ankit @ Dhillu, aged about 30 years	141	30.12.2023	323, 324, 325, 326, 341, 148, 149 of IPC	City-2 Abohar	Fazilka

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there are two injuries attributed to the petitioner, one caused by *kappa* blow to the head and the other to the left arm, both of which are declared grievous in nature.



It is further submitted that there are total six accused persons in the case, and five of them have already been granted bail. It is pointed out that the injured person, Ritik, was discharged from the hospital a long time ago and is now completely healthy.

3. It is further contended that petitioner is in judicial custody since 04.01.2025. At present, no other criminal case is pending against him. An earlier criminal case registered against the petitioner was quashed on the basis of a compromise between the parties. Moreover, all the offences alleged in the present case are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate.

4. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the status report dated 16.09.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. From the status of the trial, it is observed that out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined, so far. It is informed that the injured person, Ritik, has already been examined and has fully supported the prosecution's case.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that even if the petitioner is released on bail, there is no likelihood of him intimidating or influencing the material witnesses. Emphasizing the total period of incarceration, which exceeds eight months and nine days, counsel prays for grant of bail to the petitioner in the present case.



7. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that petitioner is the main accused who inflicted a *kappa* blow to the head of the injured Ritik, which has been classified as a grievous injury. It is further submitted that since the injured has already supported the prosecution's version, chances of conviction are considerably high. Therefore, it is argued that there is no justification for releasing the petitioner on bail, at this stage.

8. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the material available on record.

9. It is observed that out of total of 14 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined, so far. Petitioner has remained in judicial custody for approximately eight months and nine days. As submitted by counsel for the petitioner, all the other co-accused in the present case, including those who allegedly caused two other grievous injuries to the injured Ritik, have already been released on bail. However, it is not disputed that those injuries were on non-vital parts of the injured's body. At present, there is no other criminal case pending against the petitioner.

Considering the current stage of the trial, it appears that a considerable amount of time is still likely to be consumed before its conclusion. Furthermore, all the offences alleged against the petitioner are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. In these circumstances, this Court is of the view that the petitioner cannot be kept in custody for an indefinite period.



CRM-M-11053-2025

4

10. In view of the totality of the circumstances, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, and for the reasons recorded hereinabove, this Court finds it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

11. 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.

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

13. 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.

14. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

17.09.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: ✓YES/NO

Whether Reportable: ✓YES/NO