



311

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

**CRM M-310-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 14.01.2025**

**Prince @ Sanam Kohal**

**...Petitioner**

**VERSUS**

**State of Punjab**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present : Mr.Gaurav Kalsi, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)**

By way of present first petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.41 dated 20.05.2023 under Sections 307, 458, 323, 324, 326, 148, 149 IPC, 1960 (Sections 302, 449 IPC, added lateron) registered at Police Station Shahpurkandi, District Pathankot, whereby the petitioner has been implicated with the allegation of giving kicks and punch blows on the person of the husband of the complainant.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last about 01 year and 07 months; trial is likely to take some time to conclude as out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, only two have been examined and thus he deserves the concession of bail.

3. On the other hand, the prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel while submitting that a specific role has been attributed to the petitioner in the incident of having inflicted punch and kicks blow on the person of injured, namely, Dharinder Singh and that the petitioner is even



**CRM M-310-2025 (O&M) [2]**

involved in one more FIR under Excise Act; thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. In the present case, investigation already stands concluded with the filing of challan, followed by framing of charges and out of 26 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined. The petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 07 months and in other case under the Excise Act, he is on bail. As per the version given in the FIR, the main injuries on the vital parts of the body of the husband of the complainant have not been attributed to the petitioner and the only role assigned to him is of having inflicted punch and kick blows on the person of injured and in such circumstances, considering the fact that the trial is likely to take some time, I do not find any justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds/ surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

14.01.2025  
sanjay

**( HARKESH MANUJA )**  
**JUDGE**

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned ? | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable ?        | Yes/No |