



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

111

CRM-M- 46026-2025

Date of decision: 22.08.2025

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

Present: Mr. K.S. Dargan, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Hunarveer Sharma, 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.0009 dated 19.01.2025 under Sections 351(2),126(2),115(2),191(3),190 of BNS and Sections 109,117(2) of BNS added later on ( Section 238 added on oral request ) registered at P.S Arniwala, District Fazilka.

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

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there is delay of 06 days in registration of the FIR. It is a case of version and cross version. No injury is attributed to the present petitioner and the petitioner is named in FIR only for being good friend of co-accused Anmol Singh. The alleged injuries are not corroborated by the medical evidence. Prosecution has failed to specify the place of body part on which danda blow has been caused and this fact alone raises a



doubt qua the role of the petitioner. Moreover the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the investigating agency and abide by all the conditions as stipulated.

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 opposes the prayer with the submissions that vide G.D. No.18, Section 238 has also been added on 30.07.2025 during investigation.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering that the alleged injuries are not corroborated by the medical evidence and prosecution has failed to specify the place of body part on which danda blow has been caused, hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required at this stage as nothing is to be recovered from him.

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**