

2025:PHHC:069917



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

257

**CRM-M No.27025 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 22.05.2025**

Abhishek Kumar @ Rahul

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, AAG, Punjab,  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Dated</b>	<b>Police Station</b>	<b>Sections</b>
37	24.05.2024	Sanaur, District Patiala	307, 379-B, 323, 324, 341, 427, 506, 148 and 149 of IPC (325 and 326 of IPC added later on)

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 a statement recorded by the complainant Gurpreet Singh @ Meeta alleging that on 23.05.2024, he was on way to his house from University of Patiala then the petitioner Rahul along with his brother Aniket Rajput and co-accused Ashu, Goldy and Amritpal Singh Virk intercepted him by

2025:PHHC:069917



following his vehicle by their vehicle. They hit the side of his car and blocked his way. They alighted from their vehicle while being armed with weapons and opened an assault upon him after dragging him out of his car. In the meanwhile, accused Balpreet Singh and Binny also reached there. Accused Aniket @ Rajit Rajput made an exhortation to not to spare the complainant and then the petitioner opened an assault upon him by striking blow with a knife thereby hit his abdomen. He along with co-accused Rajit Rajput repeatedly stabbed his left thigh with their knives and co-accused also caused injuries to him with their respective weapons. Clamour raised by the complainant attracted the passersbys and they started gathering there and thereafter the assailants fled away. The cause of grudge with the petitioner and co-accused was that an altercation had taken place on 19.05.2024 between the petitioner and Rahul, friend of the complainant and the complainant had supported his friend. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested and is in custody since 28.08.2024. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The FIR is a counterblast to the FIR lodged against the complainant and his accomplices on 20.05.2024 by him. The complainant himself is a man of criminal antecedents as many criminal cases have been registered against him. The petitioner used to desist him from selling narcotic substance. The complainant had even got effected a compromise with four persons named as accused in this case after taking

2025:PHHC:069917



money from them. Most of the injuries sustained by the complainant have been declared to be simple in nature except two injuries. None of these injuries have been opined to be dangerous to life. The co-accused Aniket Kumar has been extended benefit of bail. The case of petitioner is at parity. No purpose would be served by keeping him in custody any more. As such, it is stressed that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has argued that keeping in view the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. Rival contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

6. The petitioner by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object of that unlawful assembly is alleged to have caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the complainant and is alleged to have snatched his mobile phone from him. The injuries so sustained have not been opined to be dangerous to life. The petitioner is in custody since 28.08.2024. Investigation has been concluded. Trial would take time to conclude as none of the prosecution witness has been examined so far. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Keeping in view the discussion as made above but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case lest the same prejudices either of the parties, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing

2025:PHHC:069917



personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/  
Duty Magistrate concerned.

**22.05.2025**  
manju

**(MANISHA BATRA)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No