



CRM-M-48143 of 2025

-1-

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

102

CRM-M-48143 of 2025
Date of Decision: 05.09.2025

Labh Singh Ex Sarpanch

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Mandeep Kumar Dhot, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Abhishek Singla, Advocate for respondent No.2.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in criminal complaint No.COMI-41-2023 dated 30.07.2023 titled 'Harsanjam Kaur and another Vs. Jagtar Singh and others' registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468 471 and 120-B of IPC, whereby the petitioner was summoned to face trial, vide order dated 07.02.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the said complaint at the instance of the complainant and he has not committed any offence. He argued that the petitioner has wrongly been summoned by the trial Court and the petitioner is also challenging the summoning order. He further argued that nothing is



to be recovered from the petitioner and all the offences are triable by Magistrate. It has also been contended that the petitioner has been summoned in a private complaint case and as such, he is not required for any custodial interrogation. He has further submitted that the petitioner is ready to join the proceedings before the trial Court. Since the petitioner has been summoned to face trial, therefore, he apprehends his arrest, on his appearance before the trial Court.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant/respondent No.2 has also prayed for dismissal of the petition by submitting that the petitioner has committed serious offence and his bail has been rightly rejected by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Malkerkotla.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case.

7. In the present case, the petitioner has been summoned in a complaint case to face trial under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468 471 and 120-B of IPC and as such, he is not required for any custodial interrogation and his presence is required only to face the trial. Moreover, the offences under which the petitioner has been summoned are triable by the Magistrate. That being so, no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances mentioned above, the petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within a period of two

**CRM-M-48143 of 2025****-3-**

weeks from today. It is further directed that in that event, if the petitioner appears before the trial Court, he shall be admitted to bail, on his furnishing bail/surety bonds, subject to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court.

9. In case the petitioner does not appear before the trial Court within the stipulated period of two weeks, the present order shall be deemed to be inoperative.

10. Nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently and the observations made in the present petition are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present petition.

11. The present petition is disposed of accordingly.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

05.09.2025
D.Bansal

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No