



221 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55918-2025  
Date of Decision: 01.12.2025

GURNAM SINGH

..... Petitioner

*Versus*

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present : Mr. J.S. Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab assisted by  
ASI Nagwinder Singh.

\*\*\*\*

**YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0037, dated 29.05.2025 registered at Police Station Jhander, District Amritsar, Punjab (Annexure P-1), under Sections 304, 115(2), 117(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023.

2. Status report by way of affidavit of Gurwinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Ajnala, Amritsar (Rural) filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. On 01.10.2025, the following order was passed:-

*“1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0037, dated 29.05.2025 registered at Police Station Jhander, District Amritsar, Punjab (Annexure P-1), under Sections 304, 115(2), 117(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023.*

*2. Notice of motion.*

*3. Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Both the parties have been heard and material on file has been perused.*



4. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Amarjit Singh son of Lakhbir Singh with the allegations that on 28.04.2025 at about 7:00 AM his father Lakhbir Singh returned from the Gurdwara Sahib and told them that Nishan Singh had pushed him out of the Gurdwara Sahib on which he alongwith his mother Gurpreet Kaur went to Nishan Singh's house to inquire about the reason for doing so. Nishan Singh, Parnam Singh and Inder Singh were standing outside their house and he told Nishan Singh that he should not have pushed his father as he is just like his father on which Gurnam Singh (petitioner) raised a lalkara to teach him a lesson. Thereafter, Nishan Singh gave a blow with some sharp object which hit on the front side of his head and blood started oozing. Thereafter, Parnam Singh gave fist blows on his face and in the meantime, Nishan Singh snatched his gold chain from his neck and took it away. When he cried for help, people started gathering at the spot and thereafter, accused went away to their house.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated and only Lalkara is attributed to him. No injury was caused by him to the victim. The gold chain was also allegedly snatched by Nishan Singh and not by the petitioner and as such, nothing is to be recovered from his possession. Petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and his custodial interrogation is essential to recover the gold chain and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Adjourned to 01.12.2025 for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

ii) that the petitioner 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;

iv) such other condition as may be imposed under subsection (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section."



4. Today, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 01.10.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 01.10.2025, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, he shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.

6. Disposed of.

7. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)  
JUDGE

01.12.2025  
Priyanka Thakur

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |