

**CRM-29150-2025 in/and CRM-M-36994-2025****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.****Sr. No.101+204****Case No. : CRM-29150-2025 in/and
CRM-M-36994-2025****Decided On : August 29, 2025**

Lakhwinder Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

**Present : Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.**

Mr. Sulinder Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Bhardwaj, Advocate
and Mr. Piyush Sardana, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.280 dated 20.05.2025, under Sections 115, 118(1), 118(2), 3(5), 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 (Section 118(2) deleted later on), registered at Police Station Assandh, District Karnal.

The aforesaid FIR was registered on the basis of complaint made by one Gurmeet Kaur, alleging therein that on 19.05.2025, at around 08:00 PM, her son Gurpreet Singh aged 18 years went to the bus stop to buy some household items, where petitioner Lakhwinder Singh, Sukhoo and



Pola were already present. They started abusing her son and when he objected to it, then Sukhoo caught hold of him and Lakhwinder Singh attacked him on his head twice with a sword, causing heavy bleeding. Pola also attempted to stab Gurpreet Singh with a knife. Pola and Sukhoo also caused injuries to him with punches and kicks. As a result, Gurpreet Singh became unconscious and people gathered there informed the family. The injured was then admitted to hospital by the complainant. It was also alleged in the FIR that the petitioner was still threatening the family with dire consequences.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that initially, a written complaint dated 20.05.2025 was moved by the complainant, wherein it was nowhere mentioned that the petitioner had inflicted any injury to her son or he was present at the spot. Later on, at the time of registration of FIR, she changed her version, creating a serious doubt on the case of prosecution. He urged that at the time of alleged incident, the petitioner was sitting inside his house and this fact could be verified from the CCTV footage installed at his house. He is Sarpanch of the village and has been implicated in the case in hand due to party faction. Many villagers gathered at the time of incident who gave affidavits that petitioner was not present at the spot and had not caused any injuries. He further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and therefore, he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel and counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, opposed the present bail petition while contending that the petitioner is a habitual offender as four other criminal cases of similar nature

**CRM-29150-2025 in/and CRM-M-36994-2025****3**

have been registered against him. Two sword blows on the head of the injured have been attributed to the petitioner. Though as per the opinion of the doctor, the injuries caused to Gurpreet Singh were opined to be simple sharp injuries and therefore, Section 118(2) BNS was deleted in the case, but the intention and motive of the petitioner to harm the injured cannot be ignored. So, he does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard.

In the present case, earlier the petitioner was granted interim bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, vide order dated 05.07.2025 but later on, the same was dismissed vide order dated 09.07.2025. The interim bail granted to the petitioner stood vacated as he did not get recovered the weapon of offence.

As per the allegations, the petitioner had inflicted two sword blows on the head of Gurpreet Singh (son of the complainant).

Learned counsel for the complainant also submitted that Ranjeet Singh son of Gulab Singh, who helped in taking the injured in the present FIR to the hospital, was targeted in a firing incident by the petitioner and others and FIR No.397 dated 11.07.2025 under Sections 109(1), 3(5), 61 of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 had been registered regarding that incident. A copy of the said FIR has been produced on record, perusal of which reveals that it has been stated therein by complainant Ranjeet Singh son of Gulab Singh that attack upon him took place on 11.07.2025 due to FIR No.280/2025, in which Lakhwinder Singh @ Lakha Sarpanch attacked Gurpreet Singh son of late Manvindra Singh with sharp edged weapons, in which Gurpreet Singh received deep injuries on the head

and he picked him up from the spot and took him to Government Hospital, Assandh. Due to this, on the behest of Lakhwinder Singh @ Lakha, he had been attacked. So, as per the allegations in the aforesaid FIR, petitioner and his associates attacked Ranjeet Singh, who had helped the complainant's injured son to reach hospital after the alleged occurrence on 19.05.2025 and intimidated him.

The relief of anticipatory bail is an extra-ordinary relief, which is to be given sparingly. Keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the view that the present case does not appear to be a fit case for granting concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of along with the present petition.

August 29, 2025

monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

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