



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

246

**CRM-M-39103-2025  
Decided on : 29.07.2025**

Ravneet Singh @ Ravi . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

**PRESENT:** Mr. Himanshu Chhabra, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Amit Chaudhary, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ravneet Singh @ Ravi	02	06.01.2025	109, 115(2), 117(2), 118(1), 118(2), 351(3), 126(2), 190, 191(3), 238 of BNS, 2023	Chhajli	Sangrur

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that name of the petitioner is not named in the FIR, but subsequently, during investigation of the matter, name of the petitioner cropped up. Injuries which attracted Section 109 of BNS, are not attributed to the petitioner. Besides, petitioner is inside jail for the last about five months.

3. Regarding status of the trial, it is pointed out that process of



recording of the statements of witnesses is yet to commence. Considering the likely prolonged duration of the trial, it is prayed that petitioner be granted regular bail in the present case.

In addition, counsel also submits that one of the co-accused i.e. Krishan Dev (who has been attributed specific role of attributing injury on the right leg, above the foot of the complainant/injured Gursewak Singh, however, the said injury was opined to be simple in nature), has been granted concession of regular bail by the coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 11.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-34880-2025, titled as, "Krishan Dev v. State of Punjab" (Annexure P-3). Therefore, claiming parity, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that considering the total number of injuries, i.e., 19 in all, sustained by the three injured and petitioner, being a member of the unlawful assembly, is presumed to have shared the common intention in the commission of the offence. Therefore, it is argued that petitioner does not deserve any sympathetic consideration at this stage.

However, he fairly concedes that the petitioner has already undergone more than 06 months period inside jail.

5. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by counsel for both the parties and, upon consideration of the material available on record, finds that petitioner was not named in the FIR and his name cropped up during investigation. Moreover, no grievous injury has been attributed to him, and the co-accused, who has been attributed specific role in the



incident, has already been granted concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 11.07.2025 (Annexure P-3). Accordingly, this Court is of the opinion that personal liberty of the petitioner should not be curtailed for an indefinite period.

6. In such circumstances, continued incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any meaningful purpose in aid of the prosecution. Moreover, counsel for the petitioner contends that while no specific injury has been declared by the medical expert as dangerous to life, application of Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) appears to be based on the cumulative number of injuries and the fact that some were on the vital parts of the body. The aspect of petitioner's culpability and whether he shared a common intention with others is yet to be determined by the trial Court, which will require detailed appreciation of evidence. Accordingly, plea for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case is accepted.

7. 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.

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

9. 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.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

**July 29, 2025**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*

*Whether Reportable: Yes/No*