

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-36526-2025

Date of decision: 21.07.2025

NARINDER SINGH @ NARINDER KUMAR

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Imaan Singh Khara, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jastej Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J.(ORAL)


1. Prayer

This petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.51 dated 20.05.2025 under Sections 115(2), 333, 126(2), 3(5) of BNS, registered at Police Station Ladhowal, District Ludhiana.

2. Contentions

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the FIR has been registered after a delay of four days. He submits that on 16.05.2025, when Karambir Singh (elder son of the complainant) was walking in the



street, dog of Parveen Kumar was about to bite him but he escaped by running. Thereafter, Parveen Kumar, Rimpay Kumar, Narinder Kumar (petitioner) and Arjun started scuffling with Karambir Singh and Rimpay Kumar inflicted injuries to the son of the complainant-Karambir Singh. Learned counsel contended that the petitioner is at parity with co-accused Parveen Kumar, who has already been granted the concession of interim bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 07.07.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed in CRM-M-34646-2025. However, the anticipatory bail of the petitioner was dismissed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana on 12.06.2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer.


Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

Mr. Jastej Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating officer vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of concession of anticipatory bail stating that the petitioner has actively participated in the present case and caused multiple injuries to the son of the complainant.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, after given a thoughtful consideration to the submissions as made, by the counsel for both the parties it is found that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner as well as the fact that the petitioner is claiming parity with co-accused Parveen Kumar, who has already been granted the concession of interim bail by a co-ordinate Bench



of this Court vide order dated 07.07.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed in CRM-M-34646-2025 and State has failed to make out the case against the petitioner as to why his custodial interrogation is required. Hence, this Court finds no reason to deny the petitioner the concession of anticipatory bail, wherein the petitioner has bona fide intentions and is willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency within the stipulated time period.

4. **Relief**

Hence, in view of the admitted set of circumstances before this Court, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS of which are reproduced below :-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’



However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stand cancelled.

The petition in the aforesaid terms stand allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

21.07.2025
Nisha Yadav

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