



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-14927-2025
Date of decision: 16.07.2025

BHINDERJIT SINGH ALIAS PARAMJIT SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. B.S. Sewak, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.20 dated 02.02.2025, under Sections 103, 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNSS, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered as PS Sadar, Bathinda.

2. In the instant anticipatory bail petition, on 19.03.2025, following order was passed:-

1. Prayer in the present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.20 dated 02.02.2025, under Sections 103, 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNSS, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered as PS Sadar, Bathinda.

2. Counsel for the petitioner contends that :

i) For the alleged incident, FIR was registered on 02.02.2025 and after a period of 05 days supplementary statement of complainant - Balraj Singh was recorded, wherein name of the petitioner was also involved. Thus, veracity of allegations levelled by the complainant is



- 2-

yet to be accepted.

ii) In FIR, names of except 2-3 unknown persons, names of all other accused are mentioned and petitioner being co villager cannot be expected to be unknown to the complainant. Therefore, not mentioning the name of the petitioner in the initial version i.e. FIR is enough to understand that actually, petitioner was not present at the spot.

Iii) No specific injury or weapon has been attributed to the petitioner.

iv) Even there cannot be any specific motive of the petitioner to get involved in such a heinous crime. Thus prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions, and, in case of necessity, to file status report.

5. Mr. Balbir Singh Sewak, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of complainant and has filed his memo of appearance in Court, which is taken on record. He seeks time to complete instructions and address arguments.

6. Adjourned to 13.05.2025.

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

8. Besides, the petitioner would submit/surrender his passport before the Arresting Officer and an undertaking on oath that in case of leaving the Country, he would seek prior permission from the Investigating Agency/concerned Court.



- 3-

3. Thereupon on 13.05.2025, it was argued that in the CCTV footage, place of incident is seen and presence of petitioner was noticed at the spot. By recording the contentions on 13.05.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant jointly submit that although, name of the petitioner appears after five days of the registration of FIR, but if CCTV footage of the place of incidence is seen, presence of petitioner can be noticed on spot, very well.

2. However, both the counsels are unable to explain the specific role of the petitioner, if any, having been noticed from the said CCTV footage, of causing injury to the victim side.

3. Learned State counsel prays for grant of some time to examine the said position and then to address his submissions in the matter.

4. List again on 16.07.2025.

5. Interim order to continue, till the next date of hearing.”

4. Status report dated 15.07.2025 by way of an affidavit of Harjit Singh Mann, PPS, Rural Bathinda has been filed on behalf of respondent-State. The same is taken on record.

5. As per paragraph No.12 of the said status report, petitioner is a member of group of people who caused number of injuries to the injured Sukhraj Singh, who was brutally killed on the spot.

6. By referring to the said status report, learned counsel for the complainant submits that one person i.e. deceased in the present case, has been brutally given 80 injuries and humanly it won't be possible to memorise the names of the accused persons.

7. He further submits that on account of total number of 80 injuries



inflicted upon the victim i.e. Sukhraj Singh, died on the spot. Though the kirpan used by the petitioner while inflicting injuries upon the victim and one bike without number plate, which was used in the crime have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner, but looking at the gravity of the offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

8. There are total 08 accused in the case and petitioner is one of them, who all collectively caused 80 injuries to the deceased.

9. Upon hearing counsel for the respondent, this Court is satisfied and thus it does not agree with the contention of the petitioner, as the injured (now deceased) was not only beaten up but also sustained 80 injuries which were inflicted with a sharp-edged weapon and therefore, petitioner is not entitled for any discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

10. Accordingly petition is dismissed.

11. Meanwhile, the SSP is directed to arrest all the accused without any delay, at the earliest, in order to avoid the need for any explanation from him/her.

16.07.2025
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

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