



211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48517-2025

Date of Decision: 16.09.2025

NEERAJ KUMAR ALIAS NEERAJ ALIAS SANTY ..... Petitioner

*Versus*

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present : Mr. Manjot Singh Rai, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.100, dated 08.08.2025, registered at Police Station IT City PS, District SAS, Nagar (Annexure P-1), under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 304(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

3. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by Mandeep Singh son of Karmjit Singh with the allegations that on 07.08.2025, he was returning from the market to his workplace on his motorcycle bearing registration No.PB-65-AX-1794 when Sandeep Singh @ Bunty, Neeraj @ Sunty son of Succha Singh (petitioner), one unknown person intercepted him. Sandeep Singh was armed with an iron rod, Neeraj was armed with sword (kirpan) and the third clean shaven



person was empty handed. They encircled him and snatched his mobile phone make Vivo and tried to take out money from his pocket forcibly and when he objected, they started beating him. Neeraj @ Sunty gave a sword blow from blunt side but he intercepted the same with his left arm and the sword hit his left wrist. Sandeep Singh @ Bunty attacked him with iron rod on his left shoulder and the third unknown person caused injuries to him with fist blows on his leg and he also recorded the entire incident on his mobile phone which was later on shared in other groups. Then, Neeraj @ Sunty again attacked him from the blunt side of the sword on his head and in order to save himself, he warded off the blow but the sword struck his left hand's fingers. Thereafter, Sandeep Singh @ Bunty caught hold of him from his neck and threw him on a tempo standing nearby. When he started shouting, accused persons stopped making video and snatched Rs.7,000/- from his pocket and ran away from the spot alongwith their weapons. Apprehending arrest, petitioner applied for anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mohali vide order dated 21.08.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and a tutored version has been put forward to make it a graver offence. Nothing was snatched and no injuries were caused to the victim. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel argued that petitioner is not entitled to anticipatory bail in view of the gravity of the offence and the fact that the snatched mobile phone and money are yet to be



recovered for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential.

6. As per allegations in the FIR, petitioner alongwith two of his co-accused waylaid the complainant and assaulted him with sword and rod. They snatched his mobile phone make Vivo and a sum of Rs.7,000/- from him before running away from the spot. Victim was also beaten mercilessly during the incident and the accused themselves recorded the entire incident in their mobile phone. As such, the snatched article and money have to be recovered for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential. It is well settled that the power to grant anticipatory bail is of extra ordinary nature and is to be sparingly used with circumspection as also observed by Trial Court. Grant of anticipatory bail or protection from arrest to an accused in a serious case may led to miscarriage of justice and hamper investigation to a great extent. Moreover, in case petitioner is interrogated under the protective umbrella of the order of interim protection to be passed by this Court, he will not answer the questions in the right earnest and in view of the gravity of offence and the fact that snatched mobile phone and money are yet to be recovered, his custodial interrogation is essential and petitioner, thus, does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

8. The present petition stands dismissed.

**(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)**  
**JUDGE**

16.09.2025

*Ali*

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