



CRM-M-48699-2025

1

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

340

CRM-M-48699-2025

Decided on: 20.11.2025

Baljeet Singh And others

.....Petitioner

Versus**State of Punjab**

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. P.K.S. Phoolkas, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed, under section 482 B.N.S.S., 2023 (Equivalent to Section 438 Cr. P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case registered, vide FIR No.76 dated 14.07.2025 under Sections 115(2), 117(4), 126(2), 351(2), 191(2), 190, of BNS and Section 109 of BNS (added later on vide order dated 09.09.2025), at Police Station Rajpura, District Patiala, Punjab.

2. On 09.09.2025, following order was passed:-

“CRM-36280-2025

Prayer in this application is for addition of Section 109 of BNS, 2023 in the main petition/prayer for anticipatory bail.

In view of averments made in the application which is supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed and Section 109 of BNS be added in the main petition as well as prayer clause of the petition.

Registry to make the necessary correction in the head note and prayer clause of the petition.

Main case

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR



No.76, dated 14.07.2025, under Sections 109, 115(2), 117(4), 126(2), 351(2), 191(2), 190 of BNS, registered at Police Station Sadar Rajpura, District Patiala, Punjab.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioners No.2 and 3 are nearly related to the complainant. Petitioner No.3 is mother of the complainant while petitioner No.2 is his brother's wife. He has further contended that in fact there is a property dispute and civil litigation is pending between the parties. It does not seem probable that petitioners No.2 and 3 tried to drown the complainant in the water standing in the paddy crops. No specific injury has been attributed to petitioner No.1-Baljeet Singh. Co-accused Nirmal Singh has already been granted concession of interim bail vide order dated 26.08.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-44100-2025. He has further submitted that the petitioners are ready and willing to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to file status report.

List on 20.11.2025.

Meanwhile, the petitioners shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim bail on their furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/ Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) BNSS. ”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners contends in compliance with the order dated 09.09.2025 passed by the Court, petitioners have joined the investigation and has extended full cooperation. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

**CRM-M-48699-2025****3**

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Kuldeep Singh, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioners of joining investigation on 26.10.2025 by the petitioners, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioners are not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioners have already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 09.09.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, they would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

20.11.2025
ankit

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**