



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

114

CRM-M-44724-2025 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 19.08.2025

LOVEPREET SINGH

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. J.S. Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in petitioner in case FIR No.96, dated 28.05.2025, registered under Sections 109, 351(2), 351(3), 308(5), 115(2), 190, 191(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran (Annexure P-2).

2. ContentionsOn behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner has not committed any alleged offense and no injury has been attributed to him. He further submits that the role attributed to



the petitioner is only to the extent that he raised lalkara, moreover, the petitioner is on better footing than co-accused Ranjeet Singh who has already been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 17.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-37487-2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes on behalf of the petitioner 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

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice on instructions from Investigating officer vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of concession of anticipatory bail stating that petitioner raised lalkara and he was part of the unlawful assembly and his co-accused gave injuries to the complainant.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, upon due consideration of the submissions advanced and, in particular, taking note of the fact that though the petitioner was part of unlawful assembly, no injury has been attributed to him and co-accused Ranjeet Singh has already been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 17.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-37487-2025, this Court is of the considered opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted at this stage as nothing is to be recovered from him.

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

19.08.2025
anuradha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>