



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-33377-2025
Decided on : 08.07.2025

Sukhjinder Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Dixit Raj Kapoor, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mayur Kakkar, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. At the outset, in compliance to order dated 26.06.2025, learned State counsel has filed the short reply by way of affidavit of Satnam Singh, PPS, DSP, City-I, District Patiala, on behalf of the respondent – State, Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.
- Copy thereof has been handed over to the opposite counsel.
2. 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
Sukhjinder Singh, aged 48 years	52	13.03.2025	109, 333, 115(2), 118(1), 61(2), 324(4), 191(3), 190 of	Kotwali	Patiala



			BNS, 2023 (Sections 117(2), 118(2) added later on & Section 109 of BNS revoked)		
--	--	--	---	--	--

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there are total eleven accused in this case, out of whom six were found innocent during investigation. Further, two of the accused, namely Lakhwinder Singh @ Sukha and Jasmanpreet Singh, have already been granted the concession of regular bail. In fact, it is pointed out that co-accused Jasmanpreet Singh, who was specifically attributed a ‘gandasi’ blow on the head of the injured/complainant, has also been extended the benefit of bail.

4. Learned counsel further submits that two other accused, namely Ranjit Singh and Jaspreet Singh, who were neither named in the FIR nor assigned any specific role, have been granted interim anticipatory bails by this Court vide orders dated 20.05.2025 and 19.06.2025 (annexed as Annexures P-3 and P-4, respectively), and now their petitions are listed for final consideration on 28.07.2025. By placing reliance on the principle of parity, learned counsel contends that although the petitioner is named in the FIR and attributed a blow with an iron rod on the right leg of the injured/complainant Suresh Kumar, the said injury was later opined to be simple in nature. In view of the above, larned counsel prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the injured/complainant – Suresh Kumar was subjected to a brutal assault, having suffered as many as 15 injuries, out of which 7 were caused by sharp-edged weapons and the remaining 8 by blunt weapons.

It is further contended that the petitioner cannot claim parity with co-accused – Ranjit Singh and Jaspreet Singh, as they were neither



named in the FIR nor attributed any specific role. Additionally, injuries No.3 and 15 sustained by the complainant have been opined to be grievous in nature. Thus, keeping in view the gravity and brutality of the incident, learned State counsel submits that petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. Heard.

7. Having heard rival submissions, this Court is impressed with the submissions addressed by the learned State counsel. This Court finds no substantial circumstance to extend the discretionary relief in favour of the petitioner, because the petitioner joined the company of his other co-accused to beat up the injured with such brutality, which reflects his nature and conduct.

8. In view of above, no ground for anticipatory bail is made out.

9. **Dismissed.**

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 08, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No