



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

210

CRM-M-18451-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.04.2026

Ishav Bhardwaj

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Narinder S. Lucky, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Jasjit Singh, DAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.204 dated 19.12.2025, registered under Sections 123, 309(4), 61(2) BNS (Sections 111(2), 238 BNS added later on), Old Sections 328, 392, 120-B IPC and corresponding Section 111(2) does not find mention in IPC which was added later on) at Police Station Mataur, District SAS Nagar, (Mohali).

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 3 months. There is unexplained delay of 6 days in lodging the FIR. His name surfaced based on the disclosure statement of co-accused Aditi @ Navdeep Kaur and Tarlochan. The allegations against him are of having taken away the co-accused, after the incident took place, wherein the allegations of theft are against the aforesaid co-accused Aditi. Challan was presented on 27.02.2026, however, charges have not been framed in all there are 21 prosecution witnesses. There is no other case is pending against the petitioner.

3. The custody certificate dated 08.04.2026, filed by the learned State



counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 2 months and 30 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner to have connived with the co-accused Aditi in the commission of offence. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage and the petitioner being not involved in any other case.

5. Heard.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 2 months and 30 days; not involved in any other case; challan stands presented on 27.02.2026, however, charges are yet to be framed and there are a total of 21 prosecution witnesses, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.



- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

10.04.2026

M.Kamra

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No