



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

213

CRM-M-48941-2025(O&M)

Date of decision: 19th September, 2025

Kuldeep Singh @ Kuldeep Singh Sidhu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, 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. 113 dated 02.08.2025 registered under Sections 109, 126(2), 115(2), 61(2), 191(3), 190 and 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station City-1, Mansa, District Mansa.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Nilesh Kumar Gade, who was working as Plant Head at Power Mak Project Limited Company, Talwandi Sabo, alleging that it was mandatory for the employees of his company to undergo medical examination before starting work. The petitioner and the co-accused were running a multipurpose laboratory and the employees of his



company were undergoing medical tests with their lab. Since the medical reports of the laboratory of the petitioner were not found to be satisfactory, therefore, the authorities of the company were proposing to set up a medical laboratory in its plant. The petitioner and the co-accused had come to know about this fact and were offended with the complainant and had been extending threats to him.

3. It was further alleged that in the morning of 01.08.2025, when the complainant was going towards the plant, he was intercepted by five persons, one of whom was Baljinder Singh already known to him. All of them encircled him and opened an assault upon him thereby causing injuries. They were proclaiming that he would be taught a lesson for proposing to establish lab in the plant. 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, Mansa, which was dismissed vide order dated 20.08.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not the assailant. Compromise has been arrived at between the parties and the complainant has executed written compromise as Annexure A-1 on 12.09.2025. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

5. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he hatched a



conspiracy with the co-accused in pursuance of which the co-accused had caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the complainant. The victim had sustained as many as 12 injuries. His custodial interrogation is must for conducting thorough investigation in the matter. No extra ordinary or sparing circumstance has even otherwise been made out for extending benefit of bail to the petitioner. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and in pursuance thereof, the co-accused are alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object of that assembly, they are alleged to have caused injuries to the complainant. Though no relevance can be given to the compromise which is stated to have been arrived at between the complainant and himself, but given the nature of the allegations to the effect that the petitioner was not amongst the assailants and the fact that he was the main conspirator or it was on his behest that the assailants had caused injuries to the victim, is to be decided only after thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial and no conclusion can be drawn at this stage, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on pre-arrest bail, subject to his surrender before the Investigating/Arresting Officer within a period of ten days from the date of passing of this order and on his surrender within that period, he shall be



released on bail by the Investigating Officer on furnishing bonds to its satisfaction and the 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.

8. 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.

9. 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

19th September, 2025

Parveen Sharma

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

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