



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

206

CRM-M-34058-2025

Date of decision: 8th August, 2025

Bhinderjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 25 dated 01.05.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 351(3), 190, 191(3) and 26(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Payal, District Khanna.

2. As per the allegations, on the night of 28.04.2025, the complainant Harmandeep Singh was going towards his village on foot, when he was intercepted by accused Makhan Singh, who stopped his motor bike by coming in front of the same. At the same time, the petitioner reached there in a truck trolley, he alighted from the same and opened an attack upon the complainant by striking a blow with an iron *daha*. The accused Makhan Singh also struck a blow with an iron rod. Co-accused Arshdeep and Rajdeep Singh who also reached there, gave fist blows to him, due to which he had fallen down. Then co-accused Harpal reached there and extended



beatings to him along with other accused. On clamour being raised, some public persons had reached there and then the assailants fled. The complainant got him admitted in hospital with the assistance of his friend Sehajpreet Singh, who was called by him at the spot. The motive was some previous quarrel that had taken place between the petitioner and the co-accused. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, which was dismissed vide order dated 03.06.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The injury attributed to him is on non-vital part of the body. He has already joined the investigation and is ready to join the investigation again. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Vide order dated 03.07.2025, the respondent-State was directed to file status report and in the meanwhile, no coercive steps was directed be taken against the petitioner. It is also submitted by learned State counsel that the petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner has joined investigation. There is delay of two days in lodging of the FIR. In view of the fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required, coupled with



the fact that the subject offences are triable by Magistrate and injuries as sustained by the complainant are on non-vital parts, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. Accordingly, the petition is allowed, subject to petitioner's **again** appearing before the Investigating Officer and joining investigation within a period of ten days and on his surrender within that period, he shall be released on bail by the **Investigating Officer** on furnishing bonds to its satisfaction and subject to following conditions:-

(i) the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the investigating officer/arresting officer as and when required.

(ii) he shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat 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.

(iii) he shall not commit any similar offence while on bail.

7. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

8. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

8th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*

2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*