



CRM-M-29488-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

233

CRM-M-29488-2025  
Decided on : 16.07.2025

RAVI AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Ashok Kumar Khunger, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

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 petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have 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
(1) Ravi, aged about 24 years, and (2) Manish, aged about 23 years	0036	16.03.2025	118(1), 115(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS (offence under Section 118(2) BNS was added subsequently, vide DDR No.22 dated 10.06.2025)	City-2, Abohar	Fazilka

2. On facts, counsel for the petitioners and learned State counsel jointly submit and confirm that offence under Section 118(2) of



the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) was added subsequently on 10.06.2025, whereas FIR was initially registered on 16.03.2025.

3. It is further submitted that there are two victims in the present case, namely Vishal and Vikramjit Singh @ Vicky (who is also the complainant). Petitioner No.1 – Ravi has been attributed with three injuries to Vishal, allegedly caused with a blunt weapon, all of which have been opined to be simple in nature. Petitioner No.2 – Manish is alleged to have caused an injury to the complainant Vikramjit Singh @ Vicky with a sharp-edged weapon, i.e. *kappa*. However, it is not disputed that Section 118(2) BNS was added nearly three months after the initial registration of the FIR.

4. It is also informed that whether the offence under Section 118(2) of BNS, 2023, is actually made out or not, remains a significant issue and that is yet to be determined by the trial Court at the final stage of the proceedings.

5. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available on file. Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and noticing the fact that all the offences involved are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, this Court is of the opinion that it is a fit case to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **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.

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

8. 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.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

16.07.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO  
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO