



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-53346-2024

Date of decision: 23.01.2025

Roshan Lal and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Gurmej S. Bhinder, Advocate for
Mr. S. K. Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') in case FIR No.101 dated 25.09.2024 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 191(2), 190, 351(2), 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Sadar, District Pathankot.

2. Power of attorney on behalf of the complainant has been filed in the Court today which is taken on record.

3. On 24.10.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioners and asked them to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that on account of some previous dispute between the parties, who



CRM-M-53346-2024

are immediate neighbours, a false and frivolous case has been planted upon the petitioners; petitioner No.1 is alleged to have inflicted simple injury on the left arm of the complainant with the handsaw whereas petitioner No.2 is alleged to have thrown a brick towards the forehead of the complainant, which injury also was opined to be simple in nature. It has also been submitted that there was a delay of 20 days in the lodging of the FIR, which further lends credence to the petitioners being falsely implicated in the present case on account of strained relations between the parties.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in compliance of order dated 24.10.2024, the petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioners having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioners are not required for further investigation much less for their custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 24.10.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

23.01.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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