

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

CRM-M-35433-2025
Reserved on: 05.08.2025
Pronounced on: 27.08.2025

Lovejot Singh @ Lavi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Naveen K. Kuhad, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

* * * *

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
02	16.01.2025	Sadar Rampura, District Bathinda	118 (1)/115(2)/3(5) of BNS

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 6 of the bail petition, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the status report filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“Statement of Jiwan Singh Son of Satpal Singh Son of Sohna Singh resident of Village Buggar District Bathinda, aged about 33 years. Mobile No.98149-xxxxx. Stated that I am resident of the above address and doing the labour work. I am married, I have two children. On dated 13.01.2025, our entire family had put on a fire (Dhuni) in front of our gate because it was the festival of Lohri. Then at about 09:30PM, when we got up from the Dhuni and started going inside the gate, that our neighbors Lovejot Singh Son of Prem Singh, Akasdeep Singh Son of Lalu Singh, Mamna Son of Pol Singh and Deep Singh Son of Jagga Singh resident of Buggar came in front of us. Lovejot Singh was holding a Sword and the rest of the people were holding the arms of the handle of Spade (Kahi), Deep Singh gave Lalkara that today we teach him a lesson, it becomes very important. Then Akasdeep Singh gave handle of Spade (kahi) blow upon me who was holding in his hand which hit my left arm and elbow, then Lovejot Singh gave Sword blow upon me he was holding in his hand which hit my left arm wrist. Then Deep Singh

gave handle of Spade (Kahi) blow upon me which hit on my left thigh then Mamuna gave handle of Spade (Kahi) blow upon me he was holding in his hand which hit my back side of leg. Then Akasdeep Singh pushed me and threw me down, due to falling down all these people kicked blow upon me, when I raised raula of Marta Marta then the all these people ran away from the spot along with their respective weapons. Then after arranging the vehicle and money, then on dated 14.01.2025 my uncle's son namely Mithu Singh Son of Balwant Singh resident of Buggar got me admitted in the Civil Hospital, Rampura for treatment, where I am undergoing treatment. Lovejot Singh above said in connivance with each other gave beatings to me. Strict legal action may kindly be taken against them. A long time ago Lovejot Singh above said had altercation with my uncle's grandsons, I stopped them from quarreling with each other. So due to that reason they hold a grudge against me. Statement recorded to you, listened and found to be correct. Sd/- Jeevan Singh."

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.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the status report.

7. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which read as follows:

"8 (G). The evidence against the petitioners.

As per record, the statement of complainant/injured Jiwan Singh as well as circumstances of case FIR, the accused/petitioner was prima facie committed the offences involved in the present case FIR, as stated earlier, he had given merciless beatings to injured Jiwan Singh with their deadly weapons in connivance with each other and unlawfully assembled with each other.

(H) The role of the petitioners.

As per record, the accused/petitioner Lovejot Singh alias Lavi being prima and active part of unlawful assembly and under conspiracy had given merciless beatings to injured Jiwan Singh with their deadly weapons as such he in connivance with others had prima facie committed the offences involved in the present case FIR."

8. According to the status report, the injury attributed to the petitioner, Lovejot Singh, was caused by a sword and inflicted on the wrist. All the injuries on the person of victim are simple in nature.

9. 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.
10. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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) | |
14. 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.
15. 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.

16. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the victim, 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 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 of the uploading of this order on the official webpage of this Court 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.

17. 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."

18. 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.

19. 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.

20. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

21. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

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

23. 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.

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

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

27.08.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.