



**CRM-M-26030-2025****2**

thumb was amputated. It came to the knowledge of the complainant that said Briendar Kumar used to work as a Bouncer. Thereafter, CCTV footage of the place was collected, where the fight took place, which revealed that the injured had gone to Central Mall along with his friends. Some altercation took place between the petitioner and aforesaid Briendar Kumar in the basement parking area. The footage further reflected that the petitioner along with his 5-6 friends caused injuries to Briendar Kumar with *kirpans* and *dandas*. They also snatched his gold chain, mobile phone and money and fled away from the spot in Scorpio vehicle. It also came on record that the petitioner was serving as Constable in Punjab Police. Under these circumstances, FIR in question was registered against the petitioner and others.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present FIR has been falsely registered against the petitioner only being the police official as he had stopped the injured from creating ruckus in his official capacity. The petitioner was on his official duty at the time of incident and he was not present at the time of alleged occurrence. The injuries have been fabricated on the injured to falsely implicate the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner was not visible in the CCTV footage and only the petitioner has been nominated as accused in the present case and other accused have not been named. He further urged that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and therefore, he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Additional Status Report, by way of affidavit of SI Sanjay Dutt, 1075, CHG, Police Station, Industrial Area, UT Chandigarh has been filed today in Court on behalf of respondent – UT Chandigarh, which is



**CRM-M-26030-2025**

**3**

taken on record.

Learned State counsel has opposed the present bail petition while contending that serious and grave allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. So, the petitioner does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail and the present petition deserves dismissal.

As per the allegations, the petitioner has inflicted injuries on thumb of injured with sharp edged weapon and there was amputation of Phaynx of his left thumb. On the basis of said injury offence under Section 118(2) BNS was added later on, which was declared grievous in nature. The contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner are matter of trial. At this stage, when there is specific injury attributed to the petitioner, which resulted into amputation of Phaynx of left thumb of the injured and when weapon used in offence is yet to be recovered, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much necessary.

Keeping in view the specific allegations regarding involvement of the petitioner, no ground for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

**August 06, 2025**

*monika*

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)  
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>