

CRM-M-48449-2026

CNR No: PHHC011433462026

2026:PHHC:123441



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

210

**CRM-M-48449-2026
Date of Decision: 02.09.2026**

Harinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through V.C.)

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 123 dated 18.06.2026, registered under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5), 140(4) and 118(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 323, 341, 506(1), 34, 364 and 326 of the Indian Penal Code), at Police Station Pasyana, District Patiala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that in the present case, he has been falsely implicated due to a pre-existing dispute between the petitioner and the complainant regarding an agricultural land. Even, as per the complainant, the petitioner was putting soil in his fields and a dispute arose between the parties in this regard. He further submits that the occurrence had taken place in the present case on 13th June 2026 and the FIR was ordered to be registered on 18th June 2026, after a delay of 05 days from the alleged occurrence. Further, even the police obtained a report from the Rajendra Government Medical College and Hospital, Patiala, after a period of 05 weeks and wrongly added offence under Section 118 (2) of BNS. He further submits that no objectionable video was prepared by the petitioner and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed a short reply by way of an affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Samana, District Patiala, and the same is taken on record.

4. Learned State counsel submits that as per the prosecution version, the petitioner, in collusion with his co-accused, had firstly abducted the complainant in the present case and he was taken to another place. After abduction, Bhupinder Singh, complainant-injured was caused following injuries by the petitioner and his accomplices:-

- 1) *Patient complains of headache. Lacerated wound of size 1.5 x 0.3 cm with clotted blood, swelling and abrasion around the wound, obliquely placed with irregular margins present just below right eye. Diffuse swelling present around right eye. Tenderness present all over head, forehead, face and right eye. Adv- Xray and observation*
- 2) *Patient complains of pain in chest. Tenderness present all over chest. Advised X ray and observation*
- 3) *Patient complains of pain in abdomen. Tenderness present all over abdomen. Advised Xray and observation*
- 4) *Multiple reddish bruises of size varying from 4.5x1.2 cm to 2.5x0.9 cm present on back. Tenderness present all over back. Advised X ray and observation.*

5. Learned State counsel submits that an opinion was sought with regard to the injuries suffered by Bhupinder Singh complainant-injured and the injury No. 1 has been declared to be grievous in nature. Learned State counsel further submits that in fact the petitioner and his accomplices had also prepared an objectionable video of the complainant by removing his clothes. Thus, not only the weapon of offence but the said video is also to be recovered from the petitioner.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record very carefully.

7. In the present case, as per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner and his accomplices had abducted Bhupinder Singh and after taking him to another place, the petitioner gave a blow on the right eye of the complainant with an iron rod and the said injury has

been declared to be grievous in nature. Apart from that, the petitioner and his companions had also prepared an objectionable video of the complainant by removing his clothes. Thus, in the considered opinion of the Court, the weapon of offence as well as the objectionable video are yet to be recovered from the petitioner and his custodial interrogation would be imperative. Apart from that, keeping in view the gravity of the offence also, the petitioner is not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail. The petition is accordingly ordered to be dismissed.

02.09.2026
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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