



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

223

CRM-M-5319-2025

Date of Decision: 11.03.2025

Balkar Singh

..... Petitioner

*Versus*

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA**

Present Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdev Singh, A.A.G, Punjab.

Mr. L.K. Gollen, Advocate  
for respondent No. 2.

\*\*\*\*

**ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (ORAL)**

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Dated</b>	<b>Police Station</b>	<b>Sections</b>
114	24.05.2024	Patran, District Patiala	458, 379, 427, 323, 506, 446, 148, 149 IPC

The present petition has been filed under Section 483(3) read with Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No. 2 in above captioned FIR vide order dated 21.08.2024 passed by this Court in CRM-M-33832-2024.

2. Respondent No.2 was served but he was unrepresented before this Court, as such, this Court appointed legal aid counsel to assist this Court on his behalf.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.2 and his family members continuously extorting threat to the petitioner and police is not taking any action against respondent No.2.

4. Counsel for respondent No.2 submits that the allegations are unfounded as there is no complaint to any authority qua such threat.

5. On this, State counsel submits that there is no threat perception and no complaint about any threat has been given to any police station. He further submits that one complaint has been given, on which proceeding under Sections 126 and 170 BNS (Sections



107 and, 151 CrPC) has been initiated vide DDR No.23, which is pending before concerned SDM.

6. On this, legal aid counsel on behalf of respondent No. 2 submits that the DDR in question based on which the proceedings under Sections 126 and 170 BNS has been initiated, in fact recorded prior to the occurrence. Legal aid counsel further submits that he would have no objection in case any further stringent conditions be imposed upon respondent No. 2/accused.

7. The reasons for which the petitioner/complainant seeks cancellation of bail are absolutely not in consonance with the principles of law and judicial precedents. There is neither any threat perception nor any purpose would achieve by sending respondent No. 2/accused to custodial interrogation. However, this Court is of the view, if respondent No. 2 is directed not to enter into the property/work place of the petitioner as such:

*“Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter the property, workplace, and residence of the victim until the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial are recorded. This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation, 2018 All SCR (Crl.) 458); and Aparna Bhatt v. The State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021:INSC:192, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.”*

8. Present petition stands dismissed with the aforesaid observations. All pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)**  
**JUDGE**

**11.03.2025.**  
*Jyoti-II*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No