



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-40273-2024

Date of decision : 25.07.2025

Jatinder Pal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Brijinder Singh Loomba, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

1. This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.111 dated 05.11.2023, under Sections 341, 323, 506, 34 IPC (Section 326 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Dehlon, Ludhiana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with co-accused who are Nihangs, had inflicted injuries to the complainant with deadly weapons and as a result thereof, he was hospitalized. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, contends that no motive has been attributed to the petitioner and he is also stated to be unarmed. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and is not involved in any other criminal case. He also submits that one of the co-accused has been granted bail and the petitioner is claiming parity with him.

3. Learned State counsel has filed short reply by way of an affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police (South), Police Commissionerate,



Ludhiana in Court which is taken on record. He, while referring to the reply, submits that the petitioner was armed with a *khanda* and had inflicted injury on the left hand of the complainant, which has been declared grievous in nature. The complainant had also identified the petitioner as the main accused and stated that the vehicle used by the accused persons to flee from the spot belonged to the present petitioner.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

5. In view of the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the seriousness of the offence especially when the petitioner had caused grievous injury to the complainant, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner despite the fact that the co-accused has been granted bail. At the time of grant of anticipatory bail, the Court is required to consider factors such as nature and gravity of the offence as well as the role attributed to the petitioner. Keeping in view the peculiar facts of the case, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential for proper investigation of the case. Hence, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, the present petition stands dismissed.

7. However, it is clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not have any bearing on the merits of the case.

**(H.S.GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 25, 2025**  
poonam

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