



226

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

CRM-M-21164-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision:05.05.2025

Rajwinder Singh and another

...Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Tushaar Madaan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**CRM-15928-2025**

1. Application is allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.
2. Annexures P-1 to P-3 are taken on record.

CRM-M-21164-2025

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to them in case FIR No.0004 dated 09.01.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the alleged occurrence had taken place on 17.12.2024, whereas the FIR in the present case was got registered by the complainant on 09.01.2025, after a delay of about three weeks. In fact, the parties were having enmity with each other and a

litigation was also pending between them. Consequently, the complainant named several persons by assigning them false roles. He further contends that as per the allegations levelled by the complainant, Rajwinder Singh, petitioner No.1 was armed with a datar and gave a blow with datar on the fingers of left hand and also kept on the private parts and stomach of the complainant. As per the prosecution, petitioner No.2 Satnam Singh was armed with a baseball bat and caused injuries on the right arm, waist, thigh and left wrist of the complainant. Learned counsel further contends that all the injuries, suffered by Sukhvir Singh, complainant have been declared to be simple in nature and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners may not be required at this stage.

3. On the other hand, status report by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur has been filed by learned State counsel in Court today and the same is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioners and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case, it is not in dispute that the parties were having enmity with each other and the litigation was also pending between them. However, all the injuries suffered by the complainant in the present case have already been declared to be simple in nature. Thus, custodial interrogation of the petitioners may not be required at this stage.

6. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioners are granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of

the BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioners to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and they shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

05.05.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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