

CRM-M-28312-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-28312-2025
Date of decision: 03.07.2025

Kulwant Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Akshay Kumar Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, D.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
261	25.12.2024	Dharamkot, District Moga	115(2), 118(1), 191(3), 190 of BNS (Section 118(2) BNS added later on)

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Per paragraph 16 of the bail application, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	21	22.11.2024	316(2) BNS, 2023	PS NRI, Moga
2	221	22.11.2024	118(1)/3(5) BNS, 2023	PS Dharamkot

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the short reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“3. That brief facts of the case are that complainant got recorded his statement with the police that there is dispute between him and his brother Kulwant Singh (Petitioner) and said Kulwant Singh had also illegally occupying his residential house, in which all the house hold articles of complainant are lying. On 30.11.2024 at about 7/8 PM complainant alongwith his elder brother Satwant Singh went to his residential house for taking some articles, then Kulwant Singh his wife Gurdeep Kaur, father Gurcharan Singh, Mother Gurdev Kaur and three Nihangs were present there and said persons were armed with dangs. When complainant and his brother entered into the house, then all the accused persons started arguing with them Jand Jand Kulwant Singh (Petitioner) raised lalkara. Petitioner Kulwant Singh who was armed



CRM-M-28312-2025

with sword gave blow of his sword which hit on the left wrist of complainant and Gurdeep Kaur gave blow of his dang which hit on the head of complainant. Gurcharan Singh gave blow of his dang, which hit on the left elbow and back of complainant. Gurdev Kaur gave blow of his dang which hit on the right arm near bicep of the complainant. In the meantime, three "Nihangs" who were armed with baseball sluggers gave blows of their baseballs sluggers on both ancles and foot of the complainant, due to which complainant fell down on the ground. Then all the accused started causing injuries to the complainant. When Satwant Singh tried to save the complainant, then accused persons also caused injuries to him. Then accused persons locked the complainant and Satwant Singh into the room. When Sarbjit Singh son of Satwant Singh informed the police and police visited the spot, then accused persons run away from the spot alongwith their respective weapons."

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family. He further submits that petitioner shall live like a decent human being and shall not indulge in any offence where the minimum prescribed sentence is more than 07 years.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the short reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the short reply, which read as follows:

"H. Role of the petitioner: Petitioner was armed with sword (sharp edge) and he caused injury on the left wrist of the complainant, which was declared as grievous in the supplementary report."

7. Injury attributed to the petitioner is sharp but keeping in view his undertaking, he is entitled to bail. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.

8. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, undertaking of petitioner and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

9. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

CRM-M-28312-2025

10. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

11. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

12. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

13. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter the property, workplace, and residence of the victim until the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial are recorded. This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to *Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation*, 2018 All SCR (CrL.) 458); and *Aparna Bhatt v. The State of Madhya Pradesh*, 2021:INSC:192, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

14. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the



CRM-M-28312-2025

other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

15. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

16. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

17. It is clarified that if the petitioner violates any bail condition, the State and/or the victim may file an application for bail cancellation before the trial court, which shall be competent to cancel the bail or add more conditions. Furthermore, if the petitioner moves for deletion or dilution of any bail conditions, the trial court is empowered to do so.

18. **This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State may file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall have the liberty to cancel this bail.**

19. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.



CRM-M-28312-2025

20. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

21. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

03.07.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.