



S. No.109

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

**CRM-M-63814 of 2025
Date of Decision:17.11.2025**

Satnam Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Suresh Pal, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Jatinderpal Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. This is first petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 for grant of bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.111 dated 20.09.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 324(4), 303(2), 110 of the BNS at Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur, Punjab.

2. Upon notice, learned State Counsel has appeared. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

3. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Gobind Dass, son of Dilawar Singh, resident of Jaijon, Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur with the allegation that on 18.09.2025 at about 7:30 p.m., after finishing his job, he was going to his home in his white Swift car bearing registration No. PB24-D-9973. When he was crossing the office of Satnam Gas Agency, the owner of the gas agency, namely Satnam Singh (petitioner No.1), along with Gurpreet Singh (petitioner No.2) and Jaspreet Singh, sons of Surjit Singh; Surjit Singh son of Bhagat Singh, Jaswinder Kaur wife of Satnam Singh and Sandeep Kaur wife of Gurpreet Singh— all residents of Jaijon, Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur—were standing there armed



with weapons. They came in front of his car and stopped him. Thereafter, they pulled the complainant out of the car and started beating him. Satnam Singh raised a lalkara to catch hold of the complainant & kill him and to teach him a lesson for filing a case against them for recovery of money. Gurpreet Singh armed with a datar gave a blow which landed on the back of the complainant's neck. Then Jaspreet Singh and Surjit Singh caught hold of the complainant from his arms and Satnam Singh with an intention to kill him, gave a blow with the butt of a pistol on the left side of his head. Satnam Singh then gave another blow with the butt of the pistol, which struck the middle of his head. Thereafter, Jaswinder Kaur gave a stick blow which hit the back of the complainant's right shoulder. Sandeep Kaur gave a stick blow which hit his left shoulder followed by another blow near the left side of his neck. Jaspreet Singh then gave a fist blow which landed on the middle of the complainant's head. Thereafter, Satnam Singh thereafter took out ₹22,000/- from his pocket and Surjit Singh snatched the silver chain from the complainant's neck and they also damaged his car. Upon this, the complainant raised an alarm saying "mar ditta, mar ditta," and people started gathering at the spot, upon which the accused fled along with their weapons. Thereafter, Tahir son of Dilbagh Singh, resident of Jaijon reached at the spot and got the complainant admitted at Government Hospital, Harta Badla, where the doctor provided first aid and referred him to Civil Hospital, Hoshiarpur. The motive behind the occurrence was that Satnam Singh had borrowed some money from him which he had not returned despite several demands, for which the complainant had filed a case in the Courts at Garhshankar. Due to this grudge, the accused caused injuries to the complainant with an intention to kill him.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated. In fact petitioner No.1 – Satnam Singh is running a gas agency while petitioner No.2 – Gurpreet Singh is engaged in business. The complainant is a money lender and there were some monetary transactions between petitioner No.1 and complainant – Gobind Dass and he has filed a complaint under Section 138 of NI Act against petitioner No.1 – Satnam Singh. Learned counsel further contended that few days ago, the complainant had visited the house of petitioner No.1 and demanded the money or to transfer the gas agency in his favour and manhandled him but the matter was patched up with the intervention of the respectables and he had threatened them with dire consequences. Learned counsel further contended that the complainant by misusing his political connections had lodged the present FIR and he was never assaulted or man-handled by the petitioners. Petitioners are ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and they may be released on anticipatory bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel contended that in view of gravity of offence, the petitioners do not deserve concession of anticipatory bail.

6. The allegations against the petitioners are serious in nature. They intercepted the complainant while he was returning to his house and pulled him out of the car. Petitioner No.1- Satnam Singh raised a lalkara to kill him and, thereafter, petitioner No.2 – Gurpreet Singh, armed with datar gave a datar blow on the back of his neck and, thereafter, two more co-accused caught hold of him and petitioner No.1 – Satnam Singh hit butt of pistol on his head on 2-3 occasions and he was also beaten by the remaining accused. A sum of Rs.22,000/- was also snatched by petitioner No.1 – Satnam Singh from his pocket. As such, the



allegations against the petitioners are serious in nature. The investigation is still at initial stage and victim has been assaulted as he had instituted a complaint under Section 138 of NI Act or filed a suit for recovery against petitioner No.1. The weapon used in committing the crime i.e. pistol with which the petitioner No.1 hit on the forehead and head of the complainant as well as the amount snatched from him are yet to be recovered and custodial interrogation of the petitioners is thus essential for further investigation of the case. 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.

7. As a result of the afore-said discussion, I am of the considered opinion that since the allegations against petitioners are serious in nature, they are not entitled to anticipatory bail and accordingly, the petition in hand is dismissed.

8. Pending misc. application, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

November 17, 2025

renu

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No