



213

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

**CRM-M-26006-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision:18.08.2025**

Sarabjeet Singh Sandhu

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Samay Singh Sandhawalia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Amaninder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case GD No.34 dated 25.06.2024 (Annexure P-2) in a case FIR No.38 dated 24.06.2024 (Annexure P-1), registered under Sections 307, 447, 148, 149, 506 of IPC and Sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of Arms Act, at Police Station Sadiq, Faridkot, District Faridkot.

2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 20.05.2025, this Court had noticed the following contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the present case, the FIR was registered against the present complainant side on the basis of the complaint made by the petitioner himself. He further contends that just to create a false defence, the cross-version was recorded in the shape of GD No.34 dated 25.06.2024 (Annexure P-2). However, on investigation by Iqbal Singh, Deputy Superintendent of Police (PBI), the cross-version was found to be

false and the detailed findings were recorded by the DSP, before declaring the petitioner and others innocent. He further contends that now again without any justification, the investigation has been initiated against the petitioner and others and the cross-version is liable to be cancelled. Learned counsel further contends that even the fire arm injury, which is allegedly attributed to the petitioner, was on non-vital part of the body of the victim and he has been falsely involved in the present case. He further contends that it is a case of version and cross version and the prosecution is yet to lead evidence with regard to his involvement in the crime.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions and further submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation may not be required.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel also submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner.

6. In view of the above statement made by learned State counsel, the interim order dated 20.05.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

7. Pending application(s) stand(s) also disposed of.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

18.08.2025
hemlata

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