



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

232

**CRM-M-14649-2025 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 21.04.2025**

Simarjeet Singh Sran

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

**Present:** Mr. Akshay Chadha, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.S. Grewal, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)**

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.24 dated 08.02.2025 under Sections 115(2), 333, 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), registered at Police Station Dugri, Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

2. On 18.03.2025, the following order was passed:-

“XX XX XX XX

*Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the alleged incident took place on 06.02.2025 and veracity of the allegations levelled by the complainant was examined by the jurisdictional police authorities. Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to the police proceedings in the FIR (supra) and submits that on checking of video recording, it was revealed that the*



*petitioner was alone and 15-20 persons and father of the petitioner, as alleged by the complainant, were not found present at the time of the incident. Further, the complainant gave an interview on 06.02.2025 after the alleged incident, in which she appeared as hale and hearty. The Medical Legal Report was conducted on 07.02.2025 and FIR (supra) was registered on the next day i.e. 08.02.2025, after making several improvements and all the injuries on the person of the complainant are simple in nature. The petitioner is having clean antecedents and is not involved in any other case. All the offences are bailable in nature and Section 333 of BNS has been added only to make it non-bailable offence.*

*Notice of motion for 21.04.2025.*

*Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137; Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565, Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State of NCT Delhi 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833**, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner will be admitted to interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973).*



*If the Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, he would appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.*

*Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.”*

3. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant and on instructions from ASI Baldev Singh, at the very outset, informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

4. In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 18.03.2025 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS (*erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973*).

5. The petition stands disposed of.

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

**21.04.2025**

*yakub*

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No