



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

220-2

CRM-M-39602-2025

Date of decision: 23.09.2025

GURBINDER SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. M.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 145 dated 27.06.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 108 and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Lopoke, Police District Amritsar Rural, District Amritsar.

2. On 25.07.2025, the following order was passed:-

“This is a petition for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 in case bearing FIR No.145 dated 27.06.2025 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 108 and 3(5) of BNS registered at Police Station Lopoke, Police District Amritsar Rural, District Amritsar.

The case of the prosecution is that the deceased namely Satnam Singh was a taxi driver by profession who had committed suicide by hanging himself by putting a cloth “parna” around his neck on the ceiling fan in the room and the deceased had stated to his mother that he is upset because his wife namely Kuljeet Kaur and her brother Gurbinder Singh were fighting with him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no immediate provocation or abetment which could be linked to



deceased to instigate him to commit suicide. There is not even telephonic conversation with the deceased on the date of alleged incident or any other material to show any close proximity of abetment to commit suicide by the deceased.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation.

Notice of motion for 19.09.2025.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to file reply.

May do so positively before the next date of hearing with a copy in advance to the learned counsel opposite.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer as and when called upon to join investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be released on interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioner 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior 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.”*

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 25.07.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are direct/serious in nature and hence he ought not to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail. He has further iterated that in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that he may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the investigation/witnesses.



5. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand; especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated therein and is no longer required by the State for further custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 26.08.2025 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

8. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

9. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

23.09.2025

jatin

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No