



CRM-M-14417-2025

-1-

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

298

CRM-M-14417-2025

Date of decision: 7th April, 2025

Harpreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 183 dated 24.09.2024, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 191(3) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') Section 118(2) of BNS added later on, at Police Station Kamboj, Amritsar Rural, District Amritsar.

2. As per the prosecution case, on 17.09.2024 at about 09:40 PM, the complainant-Harmanpreet was present at the main gate of his colony when he came to know that a scuffle had taken place between his neighbour-Darpinder Singh and someone else as the car of the former had collided with a two wheeler make activa. The complainant reached at the spot to pacify them and thereafter, Darpinder Singh went back to his house. In the



meanwhile, 14-15 persons reached at the spot in some vehicles. They were armed with weapons. They intercepted the complainant and started hurling abuses to him. The petitioner opened an assault upon the complainant by proclaiming that he should be taught a lesson for intervening in the matter. Co-accused Surjit Singh, who was armed with *sotta*, accused Simranjit Singh @ Pauhla armed with baseball bat and accused Navtej Pal Singh armed with baseball bat, caused injuries by their respective weapons on the person of the complainant. The other co-accused had also caused injuries to him and then they fled away on rescue alarm being raised by the complainant. He was rushed to the hospital and was provided treatment. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, which was dismissed vide order dated 04.03.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. It is a case of version and cross-version. There is delay of seven days in registration of FIR. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. Co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. Accordingly, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the complainant had sustained a grievous injury at the hands of the petitioner. It is urged that keeping in view the gravity of



the allegations, the petitioner does not deserve to be given concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused is alleged to have assaulted the complainant and caused injuries to him. As per the version of the prosecution, he had raised a *lalkara* and caused injuries to the complainant with a *datar* thereby injuring finger of his right hand and incised wound of size of 1.2x 0.4 cm was found on the back side of right hand. This injury has been opined to be grievous in nature. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Keeping in view the gravity thereof, coupled with the fact that no extra ordinary and exceptional circumstance for grant of pre-arrest bail has been made out in favour of the petitioner, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

7th April, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned
2. Whether reportable

: Yes / No
: Yes / No