



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

CRM-M-12319-2025
Date of decision: 05.03.2025

Amrit Pal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Roopak Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Inderjeet Singh Ladher, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate for the complainant.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case having FIR No.16 dated 22.01.2025, under Section 331(6), 109, 324(4), 191(3), 190 and Sections 331(6) deleted later on and Sections 118(2), 115(2) and 331(7) of BNS 2023 added later on, registered at Police Station Talwandi Sabo, District Bhatinda.

2. The allegations in brief are that petitioner armed with sword along with his accomplices entered house of complainant Amandeep Kaur during night time and all of them attacked complainant and her husband Simarjit Singh and caused multiple injuries to them.

3. The counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner inter alia submits that the petitioner is falsely implicated in the present case. That actually, petitioner performed love marriage with Gurpreet Kaur relative of the complainant party and the said marriage was opposed by the relatives of Gurpreet Kaur including the complainant and her husband. Petitioner and Gurpreet Kaur were granted protection by this Court vide order Annexure P-1 dated 05.12.2011. It is further submitted that actually, the complainant



party is nursing grudge against the petitioner, who is falsely named in the present case. It is further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation with the police.

4. The present petition is resisted by the State counsel and the counsel for the complainant, both of whom have submitted that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and injuries caused by the petitioner on the body of complainant and her husband with the help of sword are found to be grievous in nature. The State counsel further submits that the petitioner is required for the purpose of proper investigation.

5. I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties.

6. From the perusal of Annexure P-1, it appears that complainant and her husband were not party to the concerned protection petition and as such petitioner cannot take any benefit of order Annexure P-1 at this initial stage of investigation. Admittedly, specific allegations are appearing on the record against the petitioner, who was armed with sword at the time of occurrence. As per record, the injuries caused by the petitioner on person of the complainant and her husband with the help of sharp edged weapon are found to be grievous in nature and are covered under Section 118(2) of BNS 2023. Further, the recovery of weapon used in commission of crime is still to be effected. In the given circumstances, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for the purpose of proper investigation.

7. Resultantly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

05.03.2025

Yogesh

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether reportable:-

Yes/No
Yes/No