

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

CRM-M-45015-2025  
Reserved on: 09.09.2025  
Pronounced on: 29.09.2025

Navjot Singh

...Petitioner

## Versus

## State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

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

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\* \* \* \*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

| FIR No. | Dated      | Police Station                                     | Sections                                       |
|---------|------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 87      | 21.06.2025 | City Badali ala Singh,<br>District Fatehgarh Sahib | 115(2)/ 117(2)/ 118(1)/<br>118(2)/ 3(5) of BNS |

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Per paragraph 8 of the bail petition, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from para 2 of short reply, which reads as follows:

“2. That the brief facts of the case are that the present FIR (Annexure P. 1) was registered on the basis of the statement of Sikander Singh, who inter alia stated that;

(i) He is doing agricultural work. For the last about 2 to 3 years, he had employed Dinesh Kumar as a servant. His neighbour, Supinder Singh, wants to take away/drive away his servant Dinesh Kumar from him. On 17-06-2025, in the evening, his servant was going to his field after taking meals. At about 9/9:30 p.m., Supinder Singh surrounded his servant and gave beatings to him on his person and also abused him.

(ii) The complainant further stated that his servant told him about his beatings. When he, along with his friend Mandeep Singh, was taking Dinesh Kumar to the doctor, then Supinder Singh and his two sons, namely Tejinder Singh and Navjot Singh (present petitioner), and one Kuldeep Singh, son of Balwinder Singh, surrounded them and started abusing them. When he tried

*to restrain them from abusing, then Navjot Singh (present petitioner) gave a Gandasi blow upon him, which landed on both his eyes and nose. He became unconscious and fell on the conductor's seat of the car and raised the alarm 'Marta-Marta. Many people gathered there and they got escaped them from the assailants.*

*(iii) Thereafter, Mandeep Singh admitted the complainant and Dinesh Kumar to Civil Hospital, Khera, where the complainant was referred to Civil Hospital, Fatehgarh Sahib, and thereafter, he was referred to GMCH, 32, Chandigarh.*

*(iv) As per MLR no. DS/CHC/KH/2025/30 dated 18-06-2025 of the complainant Sikander Singh, he suffered 04 injuries, out of which injury no.1 was sharp and injury no. 2, 3, and 4 were blunt, and as per MLR no. DS/CHC/KH/2025/31 dated 18-06-2025 of the injured Dinesh Kumar, he suffered 03 blunt injuries.*

*(v) On the basis of the statement of the complainant and MLRs of the injured, the present FIR (Annexure P-1) was registered under sections 118(1), 115(2), 3(5) BNS, 2023, against Supinder Singh, Navjot Singh (present petitioner), and Kuldeep Singh.”*

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State as well as counsel for the complainant oppose bail and refers to the short reply.

7. It would be appropriate to refer to para 3 (a) to (c) and (e) of the bail application, which read as follows:

*“3. That the petitioner deserves to be enlarged on anticipatory bail considering following grounds:-*

*a. That the petitioner is working as a employee in broadband company named NetPlus and was present at his duty when the alleged occurrence took place and when he left his work place and reached back home, he saw group of people gather outside his house from where the petitioner got to know that his father has been attacked by somebody and when the petitioner inquired about the same from the people at the spot, he got to know that it was done by Sikandar Singh along with who others attacked the petitioner's father by coming to the house of the petitioner.*

*b. That the petitioner was not present at the spot when the alleged occurrence as per the current FIR took place but petitioner has been implicated in the present case only to put pressure upon the father of the petitioner to not approach the police as the petitioner's*

*family is the real victim in the whole controversy.*

*c. That the petitioner's father Supinder Singh got a DDR register against the Sikander Singh and others and as per that DDR, it is categorically and rightfully mentioned that the petitioner's father was rightfully and truly attacked in his own house by the complainant of the current FIR with his accomplices and the petitioner being the son of Supinder Singh is not an injured witness in the said DDR which naturally infers to only one thing that the petitioner was not present at the alleged place of occurrence because if the petitioner would have been present, then the petitioner would have tried to intervene and would have actually got some kind of injury or any marks over his own body which are not present in the present case. The copy of the DDR dated 21.06.2025 is annexed herewith as Annexure P-2.*

*e. That the injuries on the body of the father of the petitioner were not even discussed by the Ld. Trial Court while dismissing the case of the petitioner."*

8. It would be appropriate to refer to para 6 A to H of the short reply, which read as follows:

*"That in compliance with the order of this Hon'ble Court, the following details are also submitted:*

*A. Medico-Legal Certificate of the victim(s);*

*True copies of MLR no. DS/CHC/KH/2025/30 dated 18-06-2025 of the complainant Sikander Singh and MLR no. DS/CHC/K11/2025/31 dated 18-06-2025 of the injured Dinesh Kumar are annexed as Annexure R-1 and R-2.*

*B. Victim's current medical condition;*

*The complainant Sikander Singh, and the injured Dinesh Kumar have recovered and are presently not admitted in the hospital.*

*C. The time for which the victim(s) remained in the hospital:*

*The complainant Sikander Singh was admitted to the hospital on 17-06-2025 and remained admitted in the hospital up to 26-06-2025. The injured Dinesh Kumar was admitted to the hospital on 17-06-2025.*

*D. Weapon(s) used;*

*The petitioner Navjot Singh, used a Gandasi, and the Co-accused Supinder Singh, used a wooden stick (Danda) to cause injuries.*

*E. Weapon and injuries attributed to the petitioner;*

*The Gandasi blow attributed to Navjot Singh (present petitioner) landed on both the eyes and nose of the complainant, Sikander Singh. This injury has been declared grievous in medical opinion dated 08-07-2025.*

*F. The evidence based on which the petitioner was arraigned as an accused;*

*The statement of the complainant Sikander Singh, supported by the MLRs (Annexure R-1 and R-2), forms the basis of arraigning Navjot Singh (present petitioner) as an accused.*

*G. The evidence against the petitioner;*

*The complainant's direct statement naming Navjot Singh (present petitioner) as the assailant with a Gandasi, the nature of grievous injuries corroborated in MLR and medical opinion, and the presence of witnesses including Mandeep Singh, provide evidence against the petitioner.*

*H. The role of the petitioner;*

*The petitioner Navjot Singh, played a principal and active role in the commission of the offence. He was armed with a Gandasi, a sharp-edged weapon, and with intention to cause grievous hurt, he*

*delivered a blow on the vital part of the complainant, i.e., both eyes and nose. The grievous nature of injuries has been confirmed in the medical opinion. The direct act of assault by the petitioner is the core circumstance which connects him with the offence and distinguishes his role from other co-accused.”*

9. The petitioner acted with cruelty which is corroborated with the nature of injuries which is on vital part i.e. on eyes and nose of the body and the main injury is attributed to the petitioner.

10. [Cruelty] implies there is something inhuman and barbarous -something more than the mere extinguishment of life.<sup>1</sup> The offense is heinous, and the crime brutal. Cruelty is one of the factors in deciding on bail. A cruel person is more likely to create a lot of insecurity in society. Once the courts form a prima facie opinion that the accused acted with cruelty, then such an accused ordinarily should not be granted bail, and if the courts deem it appropriate to grant, then it must be after specifying the reasons for such an indulgence. In the present case, an analysis of the allegations and evidence collected does not warrant the grant of bail to the accused.

11. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for anticipatory bail. The impact of crime would also not justify anticipatory bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

12. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

13. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

29.09.2025  
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.

---

<sup>1</sup> In re Kemmler, 136 U.S. at 436 [Refer: Matthew Lippman, Contemporary criminal law: concepts, cases, and controversies, University of Illinois at Chicago, 51, SAGE, California, USA, fourth edition, 2016].