

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

2025:PHHC:147249



204

CRM-M-37715-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 28.10.2025.

Tarsem Singh

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. Sarthak Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Adesh Pal Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.121 dated 13.06.2025 under Sections 115(2), 333, 325, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, registered at Police Station Sadar Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

As per prosecution case, the FIR in this case has been registered on the basis of statement of complainant Harjit Singh, alleging therein that on 13.06.2025 at around 9.00 A.M., he was present in his house. The petitioner, who is ex- army man along with his wife and son came to his house, who had a stick (dang) in his hand and he started inflicting blows with his stick on his head, back and legs. The petitioner's wife and son also beat him. He ran into the street to save himself and shouted or help. The

petitioner had a pet dog, a German Shepherd, tied up in his house and petitioner killed him by hitting him with stick on the head. The petitioner, his wife and son also took away a gold bracelet, gold ring and Rs.70,000/- lying in a box in his house. In the meantime, people gathered, the petitioner threw the dang in his house and fled with his family, threatening to kill them on the spot. Hence, the present FIR was registered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. No offence is made out against the petitioner and nothing is to be recovered from him. Co-accused Amanpreet Kaur (wife of the petitioner) and Gursimranpreet Singh (son of the petitioner) have already been granted concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 15.09.2025 in CRM-M-36686-2025. He prayed that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required and he is ready and willing to join the investigation and the present petition be allowed.

Learned State counsel has opposed the petition and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he along with wife and son had attacked upon the complainant and inflicted injuries to him and as such he is not entitled to the concession of bail.

Heard.

As per the allegations, the petitioner was armed with wooden stick (dang) and he caused injuries on person of the complainant but no MLR of the complainant had been placed on record. Co-accused Amanpreet Kaur (wife of the petitioner) and Gursimranpreet Singh (son of the petitioner) have already been granted concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 15.09.2025 in CRM-M-36686-2025. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and no useful purpose

would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on his furnishing bail/surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/ Investigating Officer, subject to the conditions, as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

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 application.

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

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

28.10.2025.

Komal

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