



CRM-M-33130-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-33130-2025
Decided on: 08.12.2025

Satinder Singh @ Satinder Singh Bains
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Gopal Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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
Satinder Singh @ Satinder Singh Bains	71	31.05.2025	115(2), 118(1), 126(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023	Bassi Pathana	Fatehgarh Sahib

2. On 23.06.2025, following order was passed:-

“ 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
Satinder Singh @ Satinder Singh Bains	71	31.05.2025	115(2), 118(1), 126(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023	Bassi Pathana	Fatehgarh Sahib

2. *Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that complainant, Hardyal Singh, and his son, who is presently the Sarpanch of the village, are political adversaries of the petitioner. It is contended that, in the absence of any serious or grievous injury to any member of the complainant party, a false version of the incident has been projected in the FIR. All the offences alleged are triable by the learned Magistrate, and the maximum punishment prescribed under law does not exceed seven years. However, considering the nature of the allegations, it appears to be a case where the maximum sentence, if any, would not exceed three years.*

Learned counsel further submits that the co-accused, namely Hari Singh, Rajwinder Singh, and Amrinder Singh @ Kali, have already been granted the concession of pre-arrest bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib, vide order dated 11.06.2005 (Annexure P-2).

*It is also argued that, in view of the judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar, 2014(3) RCR (Criminal) 527, Law Finder Doc Id #572180**, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted merely for the purpose of recovery of the alleged weapon. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to fully cooperate with the police. In the absence of any distinguishing circumstances justifying denial of bail particularly when similarly placed co-accused have already been granted the same relief, petitioner is entitled to parity and deserves to be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.*

3. *Notice of motion.*



On advance notice, Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. *Adjourned to 18.09.2025.*

5. *In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim 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.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends in compliance with the order dated 23.06.2025 passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation on 25.06.2025 and has extended full cooperation. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Raman Kumar, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

**CRM-M-33130-2025****4**

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 23.06.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as non est automatically.

7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

08.12.2025

Rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**