



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

216**1.**

CRM-M-27321-2026
Decided on : 29.07.2026

Inderjit Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

2.

CRM-M-27549-2026

Ram Krishan @ Ram Krishna

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

3.

CRM-M-27557-2026

Dharamveer Singh @ Dhami Bajwa

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: ASI Manjeet Singh, 431/BNL.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-27321-2026 and CRM-M-27549-2026 and CRM-M-27557-2026, as all three petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-27321-2026.

2. Prayer in these petitions, filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner(s), who have been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 126(2), 304,



191(3), 190 of BNS (erstwhile Sections 323, 324, 326, 341, 304 (newly added section), 148, 149 of IPC), in a case arising out of FIR No.168, dated 15.04.2026, registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala, Punjab.

3. Relevant extract of the common order dated 14.05.2026 (passed in all three petitions), is reproduced here-under:-

“2. *FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of statement made by one Deepak Kumar against the accused persons. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, complainant, who is running a grocery shop situated on Dhanaula Road, had closed his shop on 10.04.2026 between 9:30 P.M. and 9:45 P.M. and thereafter proceeded towards the hotel of his uncle, namely Sun Park Inn. It has been alleged that when he was about to park his car in the parking area of the said hotel, he encountered a group of about 7–10 persons armed with sharp-edged weapons. The said persons allegedly came in front of his vehicle, demanded money from him and asked him to open the window of the car.*

It is further alleged that when complainant did not open the window, the assailants surrounded his vehicle, whereupon he called his friends, namely Sumit Joshi and Varinder Singh, to the spot through his mobile phone. Upon their arrival, assailants allegedly started damaging the complainant's car. Thereafter, when the complainant attempted to step out of the vehicle, one of the assailants allegedly sat on the driver's seat with an intention to kidnap him; however, since the car was automatic, the same could not be driven away. It has further been alleged that when the complainant's friends attempted to intervene, they too were assaulted by the assailants. Complainant also got down from the car in order to rescue his friends, whereupon 2–3 persons allegedly caught hold of him and one of them snatched his gold chain. The remaining assailants allegedly inflicted injuries upon the complainant and his companions, namely Sumit Joshi and Varinder Singh, with sharp-edged weapons with an intention to kill them. As per the FIR, Sumit Joshi sustained injuries on his right arm, left leg and stomach, whereas Varinder Singh suffered injuries on his head, nose, chest and left hand. Thereafter, complainant informed the police by dialling 112, following which the police arrived at the spot and the injured were shifted to Civil Hospital, Barnala.

3. *A perusal of the FIR would show that assailants were initially stated to be unknown persons. However, during the course of investigation, present petitioners, namely Ram Krishan, Inderjit Singh and Dharamveer Singh @ Dhami Bajwa, came to be nominated as accused.*

4. *Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that although alleged occurrence took place on 10.04.2026 at about 9:30 P.M., but FIR was registered only on 15.04.2026 at about 1:00 P.M. The unexplained delay of nearly five days in lodging the FIR casts a serious doubt upon the veracity of the prosecution version and indicates that allegations have been falsely concocted after due deliberation and consultation. It is further argued that complainant has deliberately suppressed the true genesis and material facts pertaining to the occurrence.*

5. *Learned counsel has further referred to the medico-legal report of petitioner–Inderjit Singh (Annexure P-2) and submits that petitioner himself had sustained injuries in the same occurrence and was*



admitted to Civil Hospital, Barnala, on the very same night i.e. 10.04.2026 at about 10:00/11:00 P.M. It is contended that total six injuries were found on the person of petitioner–Inderjit Singh during his medico-legal examination, thereby lending credence to the defence version and probability of involving the petitioners falsely is more because genesis of incident has been concealed by the complainant party. Injuries recorded in the medico-legal report of Inderjit Singh, are reproduced hereunder:-

Sr No.	Injury details	Injury number	Pictorial depiction?
1.	Reddish abrasion 4x1 cm over forehead. Advised: Xray skull.	1	Yes
2.	Complaint of pain at right occipital region of head with no fresh external injury. Advised : xray skull	2	Yes
3.	Reddish abrasion 2x1 cm over nose with clotted blood present in B/L nostrils. Advised: xray PNS.	3	Yes
4.	Complaint of left chest pain anteriorly with no fresh external injury. Advised: CXR	4	Yes
5.	Reddish abrasion 4x1 cm over left forearm extensor aspect. Advised: xray left forearm	5	Yes
6.	Reddish abrasion 2x1 cm over right forearm ulnar aspect. Advised: xray right forearm	6	Yes

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the Investigating Agency recorded only a one-sided version of the alleged occurrence and thus conducted the investigation in a biased manner. Despite petitioner–Inderjit Singh having sustained injuries in the same occurrence, neither his statement nor version of the petitioners’ side is recorded by the Investigating Officer, which clearly demonstrates suppression of the true facts and genesis of the occurrence.

7. It is further submitted that injured Varinder Kumar suffered total four injuries, out of which injury Nos.1, 2 and 3, pertaining to the head, nose and chest respectively, were declared to be simple in nature. As regards injury No. 4, same pertains to an incised wound on the left hand, wherein a fracture was detected.

Similarly, another injured, namely Sumit Joshi, suffered total three injuries on the right forearm, abdomen and left foot respectively, and all the said injuries were opined to be simple in nature

8. Learned counsel further argues that despite the FIR having been lodged after an unexplained delay of five days, no specific role or overt act is attributed to any of the petitioners, particularly with regard to the alleged grievous injury sustained by injured Varinder Kumar on his left arm/hand. It is contended that occurrence in question was, in fact, a sudden scuffle between two rival groups comprising three persons on each side, but the police has chosen to record only the version of one party, while completely ignoring the injuries sustained by petitioner–Inderjit Singh.

9. It is lastly submitted that petitioners are law-abiding persons and are ready and willing to join the investigation as and when required and to fully cooperate with the Investigating Agency. Therefore, counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the present case.

10. Notice of motion.

11. On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Aakash Singla, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his vakalatnama in Court today, which is taken on record.

12. Per contra, learned State counsel, as well as learned



counsel for the complainant, vehemently oppose the prayer made through the present petitions and submit that the injured Varinder Kumar suffered grievous injury caused by a sharp-edged weapon and, therefore, considering the gravity and nature of the allegations, the offence being non-bailable, petitioners do not deserve the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail. It is further argued that assailants also caused substantial damage to a newly purchased car of the complainant, thereby reflecting the violent nature of the occurrence.

13. *However, when specifically queried by this Court, neither learned State counsel nor learned counsel for the complainant was able to satisfactorily explain the delay of five days in lodging the FIR and in furnishing the version to the police for the first time.*

14. *At this stage, learned counsel for the complainant attempted to justify the delay by submitting that complainant had specifically stated that the accused persons were gangsters and there was a constant apprehension that they would eliminate the complainant or his companions, in case, any report was made to the police authorities, and it was due to such fear and intimidation that silence was maintained for about five days after the occurrence.*

15. *However, on being asked by this Court, learned counsel for the complainant could not refer any previous criminal antecedents or past involvement of the petitioners in criminal activities, so as to substantiate the allegation that they are gangsters or notorious criminals operating in the area.*

16. *Adjourned to 29.07.2026.*

17. *Meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, the petitioners shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

18. *Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passports to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

19. *A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.”*

4. From the record, and on confirming the fact from ASI Manjeet Singh, it is describable that in compliance of the order dated 14.05.2026, passed by this Court, petitioners have joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard.

6. Since, petitioners have already joined the investigation and



custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail common order dated 14.05.2026, passed by this Court are hereby made **absolute**.

However, petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023

7. Petitions stand **disposed of** accordingly.

8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of their passports to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, they would submit their respective affidavits, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected cases.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 29, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*