

2025:PHHC:120563



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

**CRM-M-23104-2025 (O&M)  
Reserved on : 28.08.2025  
Pronounced on : 05.09.2025**

**Karan****...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

**MANISHA BATRA, J.**

1. Prayer in this petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 125 dated 20.04.2024, registered under Sections 302, 148, 149 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station City Kharar, District SAS Nagar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by complainant Gagandeep Singh alleging therein that on 15.04.2024, his friend Tajinder Sharma (victim) had come to his house and had asked him to accompany him to meet his old acquaintance Prateek, Karan (petitioner), Jamaha and Dheeraj Kumar. He had also told the complainant that they were having grudges against him since long and now they had given him time to meet at Nijjar Chowk for the purpose of explaining his part. On asking of the victim, the complainant accompanied him to Nijjar Chowk to meet his above said persons. They had reached there at about 12:30 AM. One

2025:PHHC:120563



youth and a female was seen coming on an Activa scooter from the wrong side of the road. One motorbike was following them. The victim identified the bike riders as Karan, Jamaha and Dheeraj. All of them stopped near the complainant and started having conversation with the victim. A verbal altercation took place between them. After some time, a quarrel took place and the female, who was being addressed as 'Sonia', grabbed the collar of the victim. Rest of them opened an assault upon the victim and gave several blows with *Kirch* and also gave fist blows, thereby injuring him seriously. The complainant rushed for rescue of the victim but he too was tried to be assaulted. He somehow saved himself. The victim was further assaulted. He had fallen on the ground and then the assailant fled away from the spot. The victim was taken to hospital but died during the course of treatment. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 25.05.2024 and is in custody since then. Three more co-accused were arrested. Challan has been presented against them and they are facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 25.05.2024. The complainant has since been examined in chief and has given a different version. No specific injury or weapon has been attributed to the petitioner. No recovery has been effected from him. The trial would take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

2025:PHHC:120563



4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, is alleged to have assaulted victim Tajinder Sharma, thereby causing his homicidal death. He was specifically named in the FIR. He is alleged to have actively participated in commission of subject crime. The petitioner has placed on record Annexure P-3, which is a copy of examination in chief of the complainant, to show that the complainant has not disclosed the presence of the petitioner at the spot. Though, in his partly recorded statement, the complainant is not shown to have attributed any specific overt act to the petitioner, however, his examination is yet to be completed. The petitioner cannot derive any benefit from the partly recorded statement of this witness. The allegations against him are quite serious in nature. Trial is going on and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. Keeping in view the gravity of offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be given concession of regular bail, at this stage. Hence, the petition stands dismissed.

2025:PHHC:120563



7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**05.09.2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

**(MANISHA BATRA)**

**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned*

*Yes/No*

*Whether reportable*

*Yes/No*