



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27442-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 15.07.2025

JATINDER SINGHPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Raghav Chadha, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. On 19.05.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jatinder Singh, aged about 23 years	42	16.04.2025	333, 115(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023, including Section 117(2) of BNS, 2023 (added vide GD Entry No.18, dated 19.04.2025)	Kalanaur	Gurdaspur

2. Allegation against the accused persons is that they entered the house of the complainant at 10:15 PM, while, they were armed with weapons.

3. Counsel contends that co-accused – Sukhwinder Singh, was attributed with the role of lalkara, and he has been released on anticipatory bail by the Court of Sessions, vide order dated 03.05.2025 (P-3).

Further submits that other co-accused, namely; Nirmal Kaur and Jaspal Singh, who were attributed danda blow at the back of the complainant,



and said injury opined to be simple in nature, have also been granted concession of anticipatory bail by the Court of Sessions, vide order dated 28.04.2025 (P-4).

4. *Counsel also submits that petitioner was attributed dattar blow, from its reverse side on the nose of the complainant/injured, and said injury has been opined as 'grievous in nature'. Counsel, however, submits that petitioner is ready to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency, if protected from arrest.*

5. *Notice of motion.*

6. *On advance notice, learned State counsel puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, after seeking instructions. And, in case of necessity, to file status report.*

7. *Adjourned to 15.07.2025.*

8. *Learned State counsel shall file a comprehensive status report, describing therein all the injuries inflicted upon the injured/complainant.*

To be shown in the urgent list.”

2. As per paragraph No.12 of the status report, which has already been filed by learned State counsel, it has been clarified that the *dattar* blow was given from its reverse side on the nose of Sukhwinder Kaur, who is daughter-in-law of the complainant.

3. At this stage, counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused namely Nirmal Kaur and Jaspal Singh have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the Court of Sessions, vide order dated 28.04.2025 (Annexure P-4).

Further submits that offence alleged in the present case, is under Section 333 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), pertaining to house trespass, which is non-bailable in nature. However, this fact is yet to be ascertained by the trial Court. Another aspect requiring adjudication by the trial Court is the ambiguity in the FIR, regarding the nature of the



alleged *dattar* blow, as it is not clarified whether the blow was inflicted with the reverse side or the sharp edge of the weapon. Thus, prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and also gone through the record available before it, and deems it appropriate to consider the prayer made by the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, present petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to join the investigation within two weeks from today, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

6. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

15.07.2025

Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>