



CRM-M-59947 of 2025

-1-

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

108

CRM-M-59947 of 2025

Date of Decision: 10.11.2025

Ravi Kumar @ Ravi Bouncer

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Harvinder Singh Maan, Advocate and
Ms. Kirnadeep Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory blanket bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.161 dated 05.09.2025 registered under Sections 126(1), 115(2), 118(1), 351(2), 191(1) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Sirhind, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused had caused injuries to the complainant and his friend, due to some old enmity.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said incident. He argued that the complainant himself is a habitual



CRM-M-59947 of 2025

-2-

offender as number of FIRs have already been registered against him. He argued that as per the prosecution, the petitioner has inflicted injury on the complainant with a kirpan but this version is not acceptable as the kirpan injury cannot be inflicted only on right finger and rather, it is a self-inflicted injury. He further argued that the petitioner was stated to be armed with *kirpan* only to make the offence graver against the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. Further, co-accused Gurpreet Singh has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 09.10.2025. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib, vide order dated 08.10.2025.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR. He argued that the petitioner was armed kirpan and along with other co-accused attacked the victim/complainant Gurpreet Singh and inflicted injuries. He further argued that the injury with sword is specifically attributed



CRM-M-59947 of 2025

-3-

to the present petitioner and weapon of offence is yet to be recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair and proper investigation in the matter. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

7. Heard.

8. In the present case, the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and the allegations against him are specific and serious in nature. He is alleged to have inflicted injury upon the complainant with sword. The weapon used in the offence is yet to be recovered. The Court is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusation against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

9. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '*State Vs. Anil Sharma*', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:



CRM-M-59947 of 2025

-4-

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

10.11.2025

D.Bansal

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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