



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

CRM-M No.9140 of 2025

Date of decision: 18th February, 2025

Vishal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Simran Atwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 BNSS in case FIR No.152 dated 06.11.2024 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 333, 191(3), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Police Station Verowal, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that as per allegations levelled in the FIR (Annexure P-1), the petitioner unlawfully entered the house of the complainant and inflicted a sword blow on the right leg of the son of the complainant. Learned counsel submits that an entirely fabricated and false version has been brought forth in the FIR in question, as the petitioner was not even present in his village at the time of the alleged occurrence. It has further been argued

that the absence of any material on record to prove the presence of the petitioner at the scene of crime further lends credence to his false implication.

3. Additionally, learned counsel for the petitioner has highlighted a delay of 12 days in the lodging of the FIR, which, according to him, renders the allegations doubtful and clearly points towards a fabricated version. Learned counsel has further drawn the attention of this Court to the MLR of the injured, which reflects only two injuries, one simple and caused by a blunt object and the other grievous caused by a sharp weapon. Learned counsel contends that this discrepancy raises serious doubts regarding the allegations, particularly considering that multiple accused persons have been named in the FIR.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Asst. Advocate General, Punjab who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner has not only been named in the FIR in question, but there are serious allegations against him, involving the unlawful entry into the house of the complainant and thereafter, without any provocation, infliction of a grievous injury, and that too, with a lethal weapon like a sword. It is contended that the gravity of the offence and the nature of the allegations do not warrant the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. Prima facie, the allegations levelled against the petitioner are of a grave nature, involving house trespass, infliction of a grievous injury on the leg of the complainant’s son with a deadly weapon like a sword. The fact that the MLR records both blunt and sharp injuries does not, prima facie, point towards the innocence of the petitioner, especially when the presence of a grievous injury caused by the sword is corroborative of the case of the prosecution. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

February 18, 2025
rps

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