



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

CRM-M-58402-2025

Date of Decision: 02.12.2025

PARAMVEER SINGH

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Ms. Ramandeep Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0075, dated 11.04.2025, registered at Police Station Samrala Police, District Khanna, District Ludhiana, Punjab (Annexure P-1), under Sections 109, 133, 115(2), 118(1), 191(3), 190, 324(4) of BNS, 2023 and Section 249, 61(2), 117(2) of BNS, 2023.

2. The present case was registered on the basis of the statement given to the police by Malkit Singh with the allegations that he runs a chicken shop in front of Ahuja Sweets shop, Samrala and on 10.04.2025 at about 9.00 pm, he was present at his shop when one Skoda car bearing registration No. PB-13-3929 stopped in front of his shop and Sunil @ Bacchi, his brother namely Rohit, Param (present petitioner), Sanju and



Gaurav alighted, who were armed with kirpan, baseball bat, dandas and iron rods. They were accompanied by four unknown persons and they all came to his shop while carrying sticks and other deadly weapons. Sunil was holding a kirpan, Rohit was holding a baseball bat, Param was carrying a danda, Sanju was carrying a kirpan and Gaurav was armed with an iron rod. The complainant, who was standing on Chandigarh Road, saw that they were searching for him inside his private room constructed over the shop and had damaged the room. When they came out, they saw the complainant standing near the counter. Sunil attacked him with a kirpan on his head with an intention to kill him but the complainant moved his head back to save himself. However, the blow struck his forehead. Thereafter, Sunil gave another blow on the right hand and thereafter, he inflicted two more kirpan blows on his right hand. Rohit hit a baseball bat on his right knee while Param struck a danda blow on the right thigh of the complainant. Gaurav gave blows with an iron rod on the left elbow of the complainant as a result of which he fell down. Thereafter, they damaged the counter and glasses of the shop and when people started gathering, the accused left from the spot along with their weapons, after damaging his Scorpio car. Later on, he came to know that his mobile phone was also stolen during the assault. He was taken to the hospital where he was medically examined. He further alleged that the motive behind that attack was that on 02.03.2025, Sunil along with their associates had come to his shop and a dispute had arisen over payment of the bill and they had caused injuries to his son, in which his son had suffered a fracture in his right hand, but the dispute was settled with the intervention of the respectable, but the accused were nursing a



grudge against him and he sought action against him.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that **the** petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Only one injury on the thigh is attributed to him, which is a fracture. Learned counsel further contended that no offence under Section 109 of BNS, 2023 is made out and no injury has been declared as dangerous to life, which could be sufficient to cause death. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and that the benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence and the victim has been brutally assaulted and he has suffered 07 injuries in all, including three fractures. He has also suffered one fracture in his thigh, which is attributed to the petitioner. The weapon of offence is yet to be recovered and in view of the gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. It is well settled that the power to grant anticipatory bail is of extra-ordinary nature and is to be sparingly used with circumspection as held in 2022 (4) RCR (Criminal) 968 titled as **"Sachin @ Sachin Ahuja Vs. State of Punjab"**. In SLP (Crl.) 7940 2023 titled as **"Shri Kant Upadhyay Vs. State of Bihar"**, Hon'ble Apex Court has held that grant of interim protection or protection from arrest to an accused in a serious case may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper investigation to a great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or destruction of evidence. The court is cognizant of the fact that power of anticipatory bail is to be exercised in exceptional circumstances as it may cause some hindrance to normal flow of investigation which would undermine the



case of the prosecution.

8. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Initially, the main accused namely Sunil and his associates had a quarrel with the son of the complainant over payment of the bill at his shop on 02.03.2025, wherein they had assaulted his son and he had suffered a fracture in his hand. The matter was compromised, but the accused were allegedly nursing a grudge and now, they have assaulted the victim armed with kirpan, baseball bat, danda, iron rod etc. The victim has been brutally assaulted and he has suffered 07 injuries in all, out of which three injuries have been caused with sharp weapons. The victim has also suffered fractures and the weapon of offence is yet to be recovered, for which the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential. In case the petitioner is interrogated under the protective umbrella of the order of this Court, he will not answer the questions in the right earnest. Rather, the grant of anticipatory bail will certainly hamper the investigation as the investigation is at the initial stage. As such, in view of the gravity of the offence, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail and resultantly, the bail application is dismissed.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

02.12.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No