



CRM-M-48749-2025

1

**102 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-48749-2025

Date of decision: 02.09.2025

SATYAWAN

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE **SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Rhthem Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. R.K. Kachura, Advocate for the complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (Oral):

1. Petitioner has filed petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.98, dated 05.07.2025, under Sections 115(2) and 118(1) of BNS, 2023 (Section 117(2) of the BNS, 2023 added later on), registered at Police Station City-2 Abohar, District Fazilka.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal activity and in the present case, the injuries are simple in nature. Injury No.3, which is declared grievous, is found to be caused with blunt weapon, attracting Section 117(2) BNS, which is bailable whereas Section 118(1) of BNS, 2023 is non-bailable.

3. Mr. R.K. Kachura, Advocate, appeared and filed Memo of Appearance on behalf of the complainant. The same is taken on record. He opposed the application submitting that the specific allegations are against the present petitioner that he caused injuries to the injured complainant and



CRM-M-48749-2025

2

recovery of knife is yet to be effected.

4. In advance notice, Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G. Punjab, submitted that the knife is yet to be recovered from the present petitioner and his custodial interrogation is required.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the above contention of learned counsel for the petitioner as well as complainant and State counsel as the maximum punishment in the present case provided under law is up to seven years and it is not disputed that petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case except the present one, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to join the investigation as and when required by Investigating Officer and the Investigating Officer is directed to follow the instructions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in terms of its judgment reported as **Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar and another, (2014) 8 SCC, 273** and **Satender Kumar Antil vs. CBI, (2022) 10 SCC 51.**

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

02.09.2025
monika

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes /No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes /No