



CRM-M-23191-2025(O&M)

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

113

CRM-M-23191-2025(O&M)
Decided on :08.10.2025

Vikrant @ Akshay

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Suresh Kumar Dhiman, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T. Chandigarh and
Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate
for respondent/U.T.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.59 dated 30.06.2024, under Sections 307, 341, 506 and 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Maloya, Chandigarh.
2. As per the allegations, victim-Shanky Rana, sustained injuries caused by the present petitioner with a knife, detailed as follows:

Sr. No.	Injuries	Marked	Injury Number
1.	Incised wound of size 5.8 cm x 0.3 cm x depth to be assessed by surgeon present over inner aspect of left leg 3.5 cm below knee joint, horizontally placed active bleed present	Yes	1
2.	Incised wound of size 1.8 cm x 0.3 cm x depth to be assessed by surgeon present over back of left	Yes	2



CRM-M-23191-2025(O&M)

2

	hand 3 cm from knuckles, active bleed present		
3.	Incised wound of size 4.3 cm x 0.3 cm x depth to be assessed by surgeon present over back of left elbow , horizontally placed active bleed present	yes	3.
4.	Incised wound of size 2.9 cm x 0.3 cm x depth to be assessed by surgeon 10 cm below left shoulder 18 cm from midline present lateral over left side of chest	yes	4.
5.	Incised wound of size 6.1 cm x 0.2 cm x depth to be assessed by surgeon present laterally over left side of abdomen, obliquely placed. Active bleed present.	yes	5.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, except for injury No. 4, all other injuries have been described as simple. Further, trial is proceeding at a very slow pace. Petitioner is in custody for approximately for the period of one year and three months. Being a young individual with no involvement in any other criminal case, the petitioner urges to take a lenient view, thus, prays for the grant of bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent/U.T. submits that, as per the status report, it is injury No. 4 that has been declared grievous in nature. Out of a total of 24 prosecution witnesses, 13 have been examined so far, including the injured, who appeared as PW-4.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. On 06.08.2025, following order was passed by this Court:

*“ Present: Mr. Suresh Kumar Dhiman, Advocate
for the petitioner.*

*Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T. Chandigarh and
Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate for U.T.
Chandigarh.*



-.-

1. *Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.59, dated 30.06.2024, under Section(s) 307, 341, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Maloya, Chandigarh.*

2. *Learned State counsel is directed to examine the statement of PW-5, Dr. Lovish Garg, Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, GMCH, Sector-32, Chandigarh, to ascertain in what capacity he admitted the suggestion and gave his opinion and that too, in the cross-examination, stating, "It is correct that injuries sustained by the patient are easily recoverable in nature and are not of a permanent nature. The possibility of sustaining such type of injuries due to a fall on the road in an accident cannot be ruled out."*

3. *Learned State counsel shall further verify, who was the actual doctor responsible for providing the medical opinion regarding the nature of injuries. Let a status report be filed by learned State counsel, clearly highlighting all the injuries sustained along with the corresponding medical opinions of the doctors.*

4. *List again on 08.10.2025.*

To be shown in the urgent list."

7. In the status report dated 25.08.2025 filed on behalf of the respondent/U.T., it is stated that Dr. Vivek Sood initially prepared the Medico-Legal Report on 29.06.2024. Subsequently, Dr. Lovish Garg, Senior Orthopedics, prepared the Medico-Legal Summary with respect to injuries No. 1 and 3, pertaining to the left leg and left elbow respectively. Similarly, Dr. Akshita Kundra, Junior Resident, Department of General



Surgery, prepared the Medico-Legal Summary in respect of injury No. 4. The final medical opinion, rendered by Dr. Rahul of the Department of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, Government Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32 Chandigarh, opines that injury No. 4 is grievous in nature.

8. Mr. Manish Bansal, Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh, explains that the admissions made by Dr. Lovish Garg during cross-examination pertain only to the simple injuries sustained on non-vital parts of the body (left leg and left elbow) which were examined by him, and do not extend beyond that.

Learned counsel for respondent/U.T. argues that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail as, per the CFSL examination, human blood found on Knife-Ex.P1 and the T-shirt of Shanky Rana (Ex.P2) match the same DNA profile.

9. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the issue of guilt is yet to be conclusively determined by the trial Court at the final stage after examining all relevant aspects, including whether the knife was actually recovered from the possession of the petitioner. Solely relying on the DNA match cannot conclusively establish that injury No. 4, which is grievous in nature, was inflicted by the petitioner.

10. At present, petitioner has already undergone incarceration for a period of one year, three months, and eight days. Only 13 prosecution witnesses have been examined out of a total of 24. Therefore, it appears that the final adjudication of the trial is likely to take a



CRM-M-23191-2025(O&M)

5

considerable time. The liberty of the petitioner, who is a young man of 21 years, cannot be curtailed indefinitely as it may adversely affect his future prospects and career.

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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, 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.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

08.10.2025

Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*