



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-33614-2025  
Decided on: 24.09.2025

SUNIL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. M.S. Basra, Advocate, and  
Mr Anupinder Brar, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, 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  |
|----------------------------------|---------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Sunil Singh, aged about 49 years | 73      | 17.04.2025 | 118(1), 115(2), 3(5), (Section 118(2), 333 of BNS added later on) | Dinanagar      | Gurdaspur |

2. On 01.07.2025, following order was passed:-

*“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:-*



| <i>Name &amp; age of Petitioner (s)</i> | <i>FIR No.</i> | <i>Date</i>       | <i>Section(s)</i>                                                        | <i>Police Station</i> | <i>District</i>  |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| <i>Sunil Singh, aged about 49 years</i> | <i>73</i>      | <i>17.04.2025</i> | <i>118(1), 115(2), 3(5), (Section 118(2), 333 of BNS added later on)</i> | <i>Dinanagar</i>      | <i>Gurdaspur</i> |

2. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the present case, despite the fact that both the petitioner and complainant namely Sandeep Singh, sustained injuries in the same incident, indicating the existence of a version and a cross-version. However, the police have registered the FIR only against the petitioner, without initiating any action against the complainant party.*
3. *To substantiate his submissions, counsel for the petitioner refers to the photocopies of the Medico-Legal Reports (MLRs) appended with the present petition, which reflect injuries sustained by both, i.e. petitioner and the complainant. It is further pointed out that most of the injuries on both sides are on the frontal portion of the hand, particularly on the fingers, and none of the injuries has been declared serious or dangerous to life. Nevertheless, petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation, provided he is granted protection from arrest. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*
4. *Notice of motion.*
5. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*
6. *Adjourned to 24.09.2025.*
7. *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 ad-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.).*
8. *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 that during the pendency of present petition, action has been taken against the complainant – party also, by registering a cross-version case against them, vide rapat No.41 dated 25.05.2025.

Further submits that in compliance of the order dated 01.07.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 04.07.2025 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.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 01.07.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

24.09.2025

Lavisha

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