



CRM-M-44325-2025

1

211

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

CRM-M-44325-2025

Date of Decision: 28.08.2025

PAWANDEEP SINGH

..... Petitioner

*Versus***STATE OF PUNJAB**

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. S.P.Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mudit Johar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This is first petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.134, dated 18.06.2025, registered at Police Station City Jagraon, District Ludhiana Rural (Annexure P-1), under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 296, 351(3), 191(3) and 190 (Section 304 of BNS added later on) of BNS, 2023.

2. Mr. Mudit Johar, Advocate has appeared for the complainant and filed his Power of Attorney which is taken on record. Both the parties have been heard and material on file has been perused.

3. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Lakhwinder Singh with the allegations that he alongwith his cousin Barinder Singh had reached at Pardeshi Dhaba, Jagraon for dinner and they were waiting for his younger brother Khushpreet Singh. At about 11:00 P.M, three cars came there and from the first car, Rehman Sidhu,



Pawan Saran (petitioner) and two other unknown persons alighted. Navjot Singh, Manjot Singh, Gopi Gill and one unknown person alighted from the second car while Swaran Gill, Navdeep Malli and two more unknown persons alighted from the third car who were armed with weapons. Rehman Sidhu was armed with iron rod while Pawan Saran was armed with khanda, Swaran Gill armed with baseball bat and Navdeep Malli armed with wooden handle, the unknown persons also armed with iron rod and wooden handles and thereafter, Rehman Sidhu gave a lalkara that he is brother of Khushpreet Singh and he should not go today. Thereafter, they attacked him with the respective weapons in their possession and caused injuries to him on his head, right eye, nose, right knee joint, right arm, back, left shoulder, left arm, left and right legs and other parts of body. While they were beating him, his brother Khushpreet Singh also reached at the spot and he as well as his cousin Barinder Singh raised an alarm and the assailants ran away, after snatching his I-phone. The injured was medically examined, according to which he had suffered 13 injuries. As per C.T. Scan Report placed on file today, victim has suffered extradural haemorrhage in right occipital region and the fractures as described. During the investigation, the accused namely Gurpreet Singh, Gurwinder Singh, Navjot Singh and Manjot Singh have been arrested and the weapons and the car used in committing the crime were recovered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. No specific injury is attributed to him. Petitioner has suffered injuries with blunt weapons. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.



5. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and injured namely Lakhwinder Singh has suffered fractures in his occipital region. Number of assailants had assaulted him armed with rods and wooden handles and he has suffered 13 injuries in all. The mobile phone of the complainant was also snatched during the occurrence and the weapons of offence and the mobile phone are yet to be recovered for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He alongwith co-accused assaulted the complainant and he was beaten mercilessly and he has suffered 13 injuries, including fracture in his occipital region. The weapons of offence and the mobile phone are yet to be recovered and in view of the gravity of offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Dismissed.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

28.08.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No