

2025:PHHC:085697



214

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

**CRM-M-7750-2025
DECIDED ON: 15.07.2025**

AMANVIR SINGH AND ANR

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajiv Verma, Senior DAG Punjab

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No. 1 dated 01.01.2025 under Sections 115(2), 221, 132, 121(1), 309(4), 351(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station City Nakodar, District Jalandhar (Rural).

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case and no specific role or injury has been attributed to them. He further submits that the real reason to implicate the petitioner in the present case is that SI Dilbag Singh, who is the Investigating

Officer in the present FIR as well as in FIR No.100 dated 25.09.2024 under Sections 109, 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act, demanded money to facilitate the quashing of the said FIR, as the matter was settled between the parties. He contends that the petitioners refused to fulfill the illegal demand of the SI Dilbag Singh and, therefore, he nursed grudge against the petitioners and falsely implicated them in the present FIR registered on 01.01.2025.

On behalf of the State/complainant

Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer made in the present petition on the ground that the petitioner have been specifically named in the FIR and specific role has been attributed to them as they have obstructed the police officials from performing their duty. He submits that as per the *medico legal report*, complainant as well as constable Komalpreet Singh have received the injuries, and the same are inflicted by the petitioners, but he could not controvert the fact that the said injuries were declared to be simple in nature.

3. **Analysis**

Considering the fact that no specific role or injury has been attributed to the petitioners and the grievance raised regarding the conduct of SI Dilbag Singh, who is the Investigating Officer in the present FIR as well as in FIR No.100 dated 25.09.2024, who allegedly demanded money to facilitate the quashing of the said FIR on the basis of compromise and subsequently harbored animosity against the petitioners for refusing to fulfill his illegal gratification, raises serious doubts on the story of the prosecution and therefore, this Court is of the view that false implication of the petitioners cannot be ruled out at this stage.

In the light of above, this Court finds no cogent or compelling reason to deny bail to the petitioners, particularly when they have expressed *bona fide*

intent, and has undertaken to join and cooperate with the investigation so as to enable timely submission of the final report by the Investigating Agency.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioners are directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to their satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

'When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person 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 from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioners do not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

15.07.2025
Meenu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No