



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

233

CRM-M-1797-2025

Date of decision: 25th March, 2025

Ravi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vikramjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Swati Batra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 09 dated 10.02.2023 registered under Sections 302 read with 34 of IPC (Sections 397, 201, 379-B, 396 and 411 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Divison No.3, Jalandhar.

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 the complainant Lallu alleging therein that he was hailing from Bihar. On 09.02.2023, he along with the victim Parveen Shukla, who was his cousin brother and one Ram Piare had travelled from



his native place and reached at railway station, Jalandhar. They were going towards the house of his brother-in-law Vijay at about 11:00 PM. He was having conversation with victim Parveen Shukla and Ram Piare. When they reached near the under bridge Dammoria, two persons intercepted them and started a scuffle with them. They started searching the pockets of the complainant and his companions. When they resisted, one out of those two persons took out a knife and struck blows in the abdomen and chest of victim Parveen Shukla. Thereafter, they snatched his cloth bag and cash amount of Rs. 3,00/- kept in the pocket of victim Parveen and fled away from the spot. The victim had fallen on the ground. The complainant raised alarm, on hearing which some passersby had reached and then the victim was taken to hospital but had been declared to be brought dead. He submitted that he could identify the assailants on seeing them. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On the basis of a secret information, the petitioner and the co-accused were apprehended on 11.02.2023. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime. The petitioner and co-accused got recovered two knives used by them at the time of occurrence. The remaining accused were also arrested. Investigation stands concluded.

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. He is in custody since 11.02.2023. No specific role has been attributed to him. Trial will take time. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be given benefit of regular bail.



4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner as in furtherance of common intention with the co-accused, the victim and the complainant were intercepted with intention to commit offence of dacoity/robbery and assault was opened upon the victim with intention to cause his death and he had died. The petitioner was very much present at the place of occurrence and was standing behind the co-accused Suresh and Ravi Kumar @ Raja, who had assaulted the victim and committed offence of dacoity. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have intercepted the complainant and the victim on the night of 09.02.2023. They are further alleged to have an altercation with the victims and robbed them. As per the allegations, two of the co-accused had assaulted the victim by striking blows with knives leading to death of victim Parveen, whereas the petitioner stood guard at that time. His complicity in the commission of offence of murder and dacoity is *prima facie* made out from the allegations. Taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations as levelled against him, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make



any comment on the merits thereof, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

7. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

25th March, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*