



214

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

CRM-M-18357-2025

Date of decision: 05.05.2025

Karan

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. Navraj Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR
No.102 dated 16.12.2024 under Sections
140(1)/115(2)/351(3)/191(3)/190//117(2) of BNS registered at Police Station
City Balachour District SBS Nagar Punjab.

On 04.04.2025, the following order was passed:-

*'Instant petition is preferred under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking
anticipatory bail in FIR No.102 dated 16.12.2024 under Sections
140(1), 115(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190, 117(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station City Balachour, District
SBS Nagar.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that
FIR (supra) has been registered as a counter-blast to the earlier
incident dated 18.10.2024, in which the co-accused was beaten up by
the complainant and he received injuries. Further, the facts have been
manipulated and the allegations have been aggravated by the police
under the influence of complainant to make it a more serious crime.
All the injuries suffered by the complainant are simple in nature. The
petitioner is having clean antecedents and is not involved in any other
case. It is further contended that similarly situated co-accused Anmol
Singh and Sohraab have already been granted the concession of
anticipatory bail by this Court vide separate orders of even date i.e.
04.03.2025 passed in CRM-M-6424-2025 and CRM-M-6954-2025
(Annexures P-3 & P-4), respectively.*

Notice of motion.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab, who is present in the



CRM-M-18357-2025

-2-

Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh, Advocate appears on behalf of the complainant and files his Vakalatnama in the Court today, which is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place of the case file.

Learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner.

Adjourned to 05.05.2025.

*Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137; Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565, Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State of NCT Delhi 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833**, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner will be admitted to interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973).*

If the Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, he would appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law'

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Lakhvir Chand, at the very outset informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 04.04.2025 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

The petition stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

05.05.2025

Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No