



106

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

**CRM-M-13747-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.03.2025**

Narinder Singh @ Nindu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.


Mr. Deepak Goyal, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.226 dated 04.10.2024 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), registered at Police Station Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur.

2. The facts in brief, as alleged, are that on 02.10.2024 at about 08.30

2025:PHHC:036690




p.m., the petitioner, while holding sword, came and attacked the complainant on his head and other parts of the body with an intention to kill him. On being asked by the complainant from the petitioner as to why he is beating him, the petitioner abused him and told that due to relationship of Taranpreet Kaur with him, he is defaming her. Thereafter, the petitioner thinking that the complainant had died, he ran away from the spot and the injured was taken to the hospital.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. In fact, the complainant used to harass and tease wife of the petitioner and reliance in this regard has been placed upon some messages, stated to be sent by the complainant to her. Further, there is no medical opinion with regard to any injury being dangerous to life and the jurisdictional police authorities only on the bare statement of the complainant have invoked the provisions of Section 109 of BNS.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner gave injuries to the complainant with a sharp edged weapon. The complainant suffered 18 injuries, out of which 04 injuries were declared grievous in nature and as such, the petitioner is not entitled to concession of anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record



of the case with their able assistance.

6. Keeping in view the gravity of the offence and the manner, in which the injuries were inflicted to the complainant by the petitioner with a sharp edged weapon, this Court finds no ground to grant him the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

8. However, nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits without being prejudiced by the observations of this Court.

18.03.2025
vishnu

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No