

Name of Petitioner (s)	GD No.	In FIR No.	Police Station	District
Sukhjinder Singh, Mohan Singh, Surjit Singh, Gurpreet Singh, Kandhara Singh, Gurjeet Singh, Sukhpreet Singh, Navpreet Singh, Pardeep Singh,	3, Dated 06.02.2025, under Sections 115(2), 118, 148, 191(2), 151(2) (3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 118(2) of BNS, 2023 & 118(1), 191(3) and	8 dated 02.02.2025 Sections 115(2), 304, 324(6), 191(3) and 190 of BNS, 2023.	Rahon	SBS Nagar

Balwinder jit Singh and Pritam Singh	351(2) (3) of BNS (added later on)			
--	---	--	--	--

2. On 12.03.2025, following order was passed:-
- “1. In both the petitions, petitioners have sought concession of anticipatory bail, in cross-version which is registered, vide GD No.3 dated 06.02.2025, under Sections 115(2), 118, 148, 191(2), 151(2) (3) of BNS, 2023 & Section 118(2) of BNS, 2023 (added later on), at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar, in case bearing FIR No.8 dated 02.02.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 304, 324(6), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar.
2. At the instance of petitioner No.1, Sukhdev Singh @ Sukha (in CRM-M-13693-2025), FIR No.8 was registered on 02.02.2025, under Sections 115(2), 304, 324(6), 191(3), and 190 of the BNS, 2023, at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar.
- Subsequently, at the instance of Kundan Singh (the complainant), a cross-version was registered by the police. According to the cross-version, approximately 27 accused are alleged to have caused injuries to the complainant, Kundan Singh.
3. The admitted position is that the petitioners party had legally obtained possession of the land from the Panchayat on a leasehold basis. While the land was being irrigated, the complainant's party arrived, leading to a scuffle. During the altercation, many individuals, who are petitioners in the present cases, arrived at the scene. Allegations have been made against all of them, except for one, namely, Inderjeet Singh, for causing seven simple injuries to the complainant, Kundan Singh.
4. Counsel for the petitioners contends that during the course of the trial, the respective parties would led their evidence and thereon, it would be determined that for what purpose the complainant's party had reached over the fields, that were being irrigated by the petitioners' party.
- Thus, the key question that requires determination is identifying the aggressor party. Counsel submits that custodial interrogation is not warranted of the petitioners, as they are alleged to have caused only simple injuries to the complainant.



- 3-

5. *Thus, prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in both the present petitions.*

6. *Notice of motion.*

7. *On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, puts an appearance on behalf of the respondent/State and Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his vakalatnama in Court today, which is taken on record.*

8. *Adjourned to 13.05.2025, to enable learned State counsel to file status report in the matter.*

9. *In the meanwhile, the petitioners, in both the cases, are directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, the petitioners shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

10. *Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if theyb possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

11. *At this stage, counsel for the complainant submits that one of the accused, namely Pardeep Singh (petitioner No. 9 in CRM-M-13623-2025), is also alleged to have inflicted an injury on the left hand of the injured, Kundan Singh, with a sword blow.*

12. *It is made clear that role of Pardeep Singh, would be examined by this Court separately, on the next date of hearing.*

13. *A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in compliance of the order dated 12.03.2025, passed by this Court, the petitioners have joined the investigation, and have fully co-operated.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer, confirms the said averment and submits that the custodial interrogation of the

petitioners would not be required now for the purpose of investigation.

- 5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
- 6. Since the petitioners have joined the investigation, custodial interrogation is no more required, present petition is allowed and ad-interim order dated 12.03.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute.

However, petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

- 7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

13.05.2025
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No