



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

**CRM-M-26327-2025**

**Date of Decision:07.08.2025**

Akashdeep Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

**Present :**    Ms. Amarjeet Kaur, Advocate for  
                  Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
                  Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.  
                  Mr. Prince Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1.                The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.9, dated 04.02.2025, under Sections 109, 190, 191 of BNS 2023, registered at Police Station Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran.

2.                While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 15.05.2025, this Court had noticed the following contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been nominated on the basis of a statement made by Gursewak Singh, injured on 09.02.2025, i.e. five days after the occurrence. He submits that the complainant and the petitioner belong to the same village, however, the complainant had not named the petitioner as one of the accused. This fact alone establishes that the petitioner had not participated in the occurrence. Learned counsel next submits that as per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner had allegedly tried to strangle Gursewak Singh, injured and no other injury has been attributed to him. Even the medical evidence*

*in the present case does not support the ocular account and the custody of the petitioner may not be required.”*

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 the petitioner is involved in a serious crime and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

6. In view of the above statement made by learned State counsel, the present petition is allowed and the interim order dated 15.05.2025 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

07.08.2025  
hemlata

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