



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

106

CRM-M- 45887-2025

Date of decision: 22.08.2025

Youdhveer Singh**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. J.S. Sran, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Navaldeep Sihag, Advocate for the complainant.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**1. Relief sought**

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.80 dated 26.07.2024 under Sections 109,308(4),324(2),351(2),351(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act (Section 61(2) BNS added on oral request) registered at P.S Shri Hargobindpur, District Gurdaspur.

3. Contention**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it was a bona fide mistake as the petitioner had no knowledge of the addition of the offence under Section 61(2) of BNS, which stands omitted in the prayer clause. He further submits that compromise has been effected between the parties vide compromise deed dated 04.08.2025 (Annexure P.4).



Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

On the asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Rattu, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, who submits that it is the petitioner who fired gun shot in the air to cause terror while threatening for extortion of money to the tune of Rs.50 lacs. He submits that vide G.D.No.18 offence under Section 61 (2) of BNS has been added on 16.10.2024.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, the assertion made by learned State counsel is improper in the light of facts as narrated in the FIR itself the call for extortion was made from Mobile No.9216990379 which is contrary to the arguments raised before this Court by the State. Otherwise also, learned counsel representing the petitioner would refer to compromise dated 04.08.2024 (Annexure P.4) entered into between the petitioner and the complainant on whose behalf Mr. Navaldeep Sihag, Advocate has put in appearance and filed power of attorney. The same is taken on record.

5. **Relief**

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction for the reason that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required as it would be of no fruitful purpose to put the petitioner behind the bars. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 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 a period of one week and comply with the aforesaid condition under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE**

22.08.2025
manoj

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