



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

104

CRM-M-34109-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.07.2025

Subhash Chand Chawla

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mayur Singla, Advocate
for complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-
arrest bail to petitioner in FIR No. 126 dated 07.06.2025 (P-1), under
Sections 333, 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 191(3) read with Section 190 of
the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') (Section 117(2) of
BNS added later on), registered at Police Station City Rajpura, District
Patiala.

2. Short reply by way of affidavit dated 03.07.2025 of *de*
facto complainant namely Charanjit Singh has been filed. Copy thereof



supplied to the opposite side. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

3. Allegations are that petitioner along with co-accused formed an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of their common object trespassed into the premises of *de facto* complainant-Charanjit Singh and inflicted injuries on his person with bricks & stones and also tried to strangle him.

4. Contends that petitioner did not cause any injury to *de facto* complainant; rather complainant, himself was the aggressor, and he tried to halt installation of submersible pump in front of residence of petitioner. Further contends that petitioner is ready to join investigation; but he be protected.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, submits that petitioner as well as complainant are the neighbours and due to old enmity petitioner along with other co-accused caused injuries to complainant without any rhyme and reason. Also submits that if petitioner is granted pre-arrest bail, there is every likelihood that he will misuse the concession of bail and hamper the investigation.

6. Learned counsel for complainant also opposed the prayer while submitting that petitioner is trying to influence investigation and intimidate the complainant party.



7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.
8. Before proceeding further, it is relevant to reproduce injuries of *de facto* complainant as mentioned in the MLR dated 06.06.2025, as under:

Sr. No.	Injuries	Marked	Injury Number
1	Redness and inflammation present on left eye. Advise Eye opinion.	Yes	1
2	Pain present chest. Advise surgery and Ortho opinion.	Yes	4
3	Abrasion present on left elbow. Advise Ortho opinion.	Yes	5
4	Pain present on left pelvic region. Advise Ortho opinion.	Yes	6
5	Redness present on neck (On front) and also at cervical region. Advise Ortho and surgery opinion.	Yes	7
6	Pain left side maxilla. Advise Dental opinion.	Yes	8
7	Pain present on left upper arm. Advise Ortho opinion.	Yes	3
8	Redness present on right side fronto temporal region head. Advise Surgery opinion.	Yes	2

9. Perusal of above injuries, reveal that *de facto* complainant suffered as many as 8 injuries on his person, out of which one injury relates to fracture of pelvic bone as well as severe injury to eye.
10. Thus, keeping in view the gravity of offence and seriousness of allegations, custodial interrogation of petitioner is very much necessary to go to the root of matter. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.



- 11. Consequently, petition is dismissed.
- 12. Observations made above be not construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of case in any manner; rather confined only to the present petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

08.07.2025
Ithles/SN

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No