



220

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14698-2025
Date of Decision:-08.04.2025

SUKHDEEP SINGH
... PETITIONER
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
... RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Tejbir Singh Hundal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Rajesh Bhateja, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of affidavit dated 07.04.2025 of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Dharamkot, Moga, the same is taken on record, copy thereof, has been supplied to the counsel opposite

2. By way of the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (BNSS), the petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in the following FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
19	22.02.2025	117(1), 115(2), 110, 191(3), 190 of BNS	Mehna, District Moga

3. Arguments heard.



4. It is, *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely roped in the present case, without having any concern with the allegations levelled in the FIR. He contends that no alleged occurrence has took place involving the petitioner, nor any specific overt act is attributed to the him, hence, prayed for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, referring to the reply submitted by the State has assailed these arguments by contending that petitioner armed with axe had given blows on the head of the complainant and the complainant sustained as many as 9 injuries out of which 2 were declared dangerous to life. They contend that the recovery of weapon used in the occurrence is yet to be effected from the petitioner and considering the fact that the petitioner had given axe blow on the vital parts of the body of the complainant and the injuries were declared to be dangerous to life, the petitioner is not entitled to concession of bail. Hence prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

6. After considering the arguments and perusing the record, it is observed that as per the case of the prosecution on 12.02.2025 at about 08:00 pm the petitioner along with co-accused armed with deadly weapon came on three vehicles and caused multiple injuries to the complainant, who was later shifted to hospital. A bare perusal of record would reveal that there are specific injuries attributed to have been caused by the petitioner with the help of an axe. The petitioner is alleged to have caused axe blow on the head of the complainant while another blow of the axe hit near the left eye of the



complainant while his co-accused also caused multiple injuries to the complainant with their respective weapons. As per record, the complainant sustained 9 injuries, out of which 2 injuries were declared dangerous to life. The recovery of weapon is yet to be effected for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

7. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

08.04.2025

Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No