



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

221

CRM-M-9127-2025

Date of Decision: 28.04.2025

RAJWINDER SINGH

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

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

Present: Mr. Kamal Narula, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

N. S. SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case DDR No.23, dated 26.10.2024, under Sections 115(2), 303(2), 190 of B.N.S & Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Muktsar Sahib, District Shri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab (Annexure P-2) in case FIR No.193, dated 26.10.2024, under Section 115(2), 118(1), 303(2), 190 of B.N.S. & Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Muktsar Sahib, District Shri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab (Annexure P-1).



2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 10.03.2025, the following contentions were noticed by this Court and the same have been reproduced below:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Harpreet Singh, injured on the side of the present petitioner. He further contends that as a counter-blast to the FIR (Annexure P-1) got registered by the petitioner’s side, one DDR No.23 dated 26.10.2024 was registered against the petitioner and other accused. Even, from the cross version, it is apparent that no specific injury has been attributed to the present petitioner and it has been stated that the petitioner had gone at the place of occurrence along with the other accused. Learned counsel next contends that it is a case of version and cross version and the Trial Court is yet to adjudicate the question of aggressor, only during the course of trial. Further, Mandeep Singh and Lakhwinder Singh, on the side of the complainant had suffered injuries in the present case, whereas, Harpreet Singh and Ajay Singh, on the side of the petitioner had suffered injuries. ”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions and further submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation may not be required.



4. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Rajinder Singh also submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the above statement made by learned counsel for the parties, the interim order dated 10.03.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

28.04.2025.

(N. S. SHEKHAWAT)

vipin

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No