



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

CRM-M No.9494 of 2025

Date of decision: 19th February, 2025

Baba Maan Singh @ Mann Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Khushbir K. Waraich, 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.06 dated 25.01.2025 under Sections 299, 329(3), 61(2), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Police Station City Batala, District Batala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case for allegedly committing sacrilege by placing Sri Guru Granth Sahib ji in a cabin at Dharampura Colony Batala, encircled by garbage, with the purported intention of illegally encroaching upon Government land. It is argued that the FIR, annexed as Annexure P-1, does not contain any specific allegations against the petitioner and has been lodged out of ill-will and jealousy.

3. It is further submitted that the petitioner, having served as a Sewadar since 1971, holds deep reverence for Sri Guru Granth Sahib ji and has been engaged in the upkeep of various Gurudwaras. The learned counsel asserts that the petitioner neither installed a tin shed over the disputed land nor placed Sri Guru Granth Sahib at the said location.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

6. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made for extending the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by reiterating the allegations levelled in the FIR. He has, on instructions, submitted that the petitioner along with co-accused, misused the sacred Sri Guru Granth Sahib ji as a shield to further a mala fide design, thereby desecrating its sacrosanctity and injuring religious sentiments. It is further contended that the petitioner, in connivance with others, had premeditated the entire act to encroach upon Government land.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material on record.

8. Prima facie, the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious. Given the circumstances, the nature of the allegations, and the potential ramifications, 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 19, 2025
rps

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