



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-22790-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 26.05.2025

MANJINDER SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. I.S. Kooner, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case
FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
102	15.12.2024	115(2), 126(2), 118(1), 351(2), 191(3), 190, 324(4) BNS; [118(2) BNS added later on]	Payal, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner
that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He
contends that no specific overt act is attributed to the petitioner in the alleged
occurrence. He submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and
has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel on the basis of *pairvi* report and on instructions from the Investigating Officer of the case has argued that the petitioner had attacked the complainant with a sharp-edged weapon with intent to kill him, but in order to ward off the same, the complainant raised his right hand and injury was caused on his wrist, which was found to be grievous in nature, and another blow on the back of the complainant was found to be simple in nature. He submits that the petitioner had also caused damage to the vehicle of the complainant, therefore, his custodial interrogation is required to recover the weapon. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

4. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the instant case was registered by the complainant on the allegation that on 13.12.2024 at about 04:00 PM, he had gone to bus stand Raouni on his car for some domestic work and while he was returning home at about 04:15 PM, one car came in front of his car out of which four persons including the petitioner, Pawanpreet Singh and Charanjit Singh, who were earlier known to him, alighted from the car. The petitioner gave sword blow towards the complainant, and as he raised his right hand to defend himself the blow hit his wrist, while another Kirpan blow was given on his back with intent to kill him. Co-accused Pawanpreet Singh also gave sword blows, which hit on the left side of his chest and backside of his right shoulder and also caused damage to his car. The injured was shifted to hospital, and the FIR was registered.

5. A perusal of the record would reveal that the injury attributed to



the petitioner in the occurrence has been declared to be grievous in nature caused with a sharp-edged weapon. As per the case of prosecution, the petitioner had caused this injury with intent to kill the complainant with a sword. The allegations are serious in nature and the recovery of the weapon has not yet been recovered for which the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

6. Therefore, considering the nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition 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

26.05.2025
S.Sharma(syr)

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