

CRM-M-62693-2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-62693-2024
Reserved on: 15.01.2025
Pronounced on: 24.01.2025

Bikramjeet Singh alias Vikramjeet Singh alias Vicky ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

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

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
85	17.06.2024	Sadar Faridkot, District Faridkot	452, 506, 34 IPC (201 IPC added later on)

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. In paragraph 9 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“3. That the law was set in motion by Sukhdev Singh s/o Karnail Singh r/o Pakhi Kalan who got recorded his statement on 17-06-2024 and rendered that "on 16-06-2024 in the afternoon he was sleeping in his house at around 05-00 PM, the main gate of his house was open and Lovepreet Singh s/o Ajit Singh r/o Pakhi Kalan and one unknown person with muffled face intruded his house, both were holding daangs and started threatening his wife Karamjit Kaur. Complainant heard the noise and came in the courtyard. Both became furious calling them in Panchayat at the instance of complainant and started manhandling the complainant and threatened to kill him. On raising alarm, both fled away. Complainant further narrated that Lovepreet Singh had fired the motor starter and cable wire of his nephew Jagsir Singh. On this issue a panchayat was

CRM-M-62693-2024

convened and complainant also joined the same. Due to this grudge, accused Lovepreet Singh had trespassed his house and gave him beating.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“ Role of the petitioner

7. That the present Petitioner along with co-accused Lovepreet Singh forcibly trespassed the house of complainant- victim Sukhdev Singh. Petitioner was also holding a daang and had a muffled face. Both the accused had caused bodily injury to the victim-complainant and thrashed him but on raising his hue and cry, petitioner and co-accused both fled away from the spot.

Evidence Against Petitioner:

8. That at the time of occurrence, Petitioner was having muffled face to conceal his identity. However, during investigation, the name of the petitioner had surfaced from the interrogation of co-accused Lovepreet Singh. The statement of the co-accused is spontaneous and further material evidence like test identification parade and recovery of weapon are still pending. The investigation is at initial stage qua petitioner.”

7. All the allegations point towards violation of above captioned penal offences but they are general in nature and do not call for custodial or pre-trial incarceration.

8. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.

9. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

10. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

CRM-M-62693-2024

11. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

12. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

13. This order is subject to the petitioner’s complying with the following terms. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

14. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

15. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

16. This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State may file an application for cancellation of

CRM-M-62693-2024

this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall be at liberty to cancel this bail.

17. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

18. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

19. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

24.01.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.