



108

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

**CRM-M-22588-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.04.2025**

Manjit Singh @ Mani @ Dana

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ashutosh Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Pulkit Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.290 dated 10.11.2024 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190, 331(6) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), registered at Police Station Tripri (Tripuri), Patiala.

2. Compactly, facts of the case are that on 07.11.2024, pre-wedding celebrations were going on in the house of the complainant, as there was marriage of his younger brother on 08.11.2024 and at around 09.30 p.m., when

2025:PHHC:054811



he was standing outside his house, his neighbour Bira @ Gori along with his mother Raj Kaur and father Sardar Singh Sardari abused him. In the meantime, cousin of the complainant, namely Shamsheer Singh, arrived and Gori and his family members used abusive language towards him as well, to which they did not respond. Thereafter, Gori, while abusing the complainant, made a phone call to someone and after half an hour, real brother of Gori, namely Manjit Singh @ Mani @ Dana (petitioner), Prince, Valaiti and their relative Lakhan along with 7-8 unknown persons reached on three motorcycles. They entered house of the complainant. Petitioner and Gori were holding swords and their mother Raj Kaur and father Sardar Singh Sardari, who were carrying sticks, also entered his house. Thereafter, Gori attacked on the head of the complainant with sword and the petitioner, with a sword, attacked on the head of complainant's wife and in order to save herself from the second attack by the petitioner, when she raised her hand, the sword hit her left thumb and finger. Lakhan gave baseball bat blows to the complainant on his left hand and to his wife on her legs. Other 7-8 unidentified persons and parents of Gori also gave severe beatings to them. When wife of the complainant raised voice for help, the petitioner and Gori grabbed her hair and beaten her. Thereafter, the accused persons fled away from the spot along with their respective weapons while threatening to kill the complainant and his wife. During this episode, gold chain of complainant's wife fell off, which could not be found. Due to the severe injuries, the complainant and his wife were taken to Rajindra Hospital,

2025:PHHC:054811



Patiala by their relatives, for treatment. With these allegations, FIR (*supra*) was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that there is a delay of 03 days in registration of FIR (*supra*), which creates a serious doubt on the case set up by the prosecution. The injuries attributed to the petitioner do not correspond with the injuries recorded in the Medico-Legal Report (Annexure P-3). Further, similarly situated co-accused of the petitioner, namely Lakhanpal Singh, has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 21.04.2025 passed in CRM-M-14151-2025 (Annexure P-5). It is further contended that at this stage, *prima facie*, no opinion can be formed with regard to invocation of offence under Section 331(6) of BNS, as it is a matter of trial.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is the main accused and he along with others trespassed into house of the complainant and inflicted injuries on the head of his wife and grabbed her from her hair and also gave beatings to the complainant. Thereafter, the accused fled away from the spot giving threats to the complainant and his wife to kill them. As such, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and his custodial interrogation is required to conduct fair and proper investigation.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance.

2025:PHHC:054811



6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the gravity of the offence and the allegations levelled against the petitioner, this Court finds no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to him. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

7. However, nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits without being prejudiced by the observations of this Court.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

29.04.2025
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No