

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-65649-2024
Reserved on: 13.02.2025
Pronounced on: 19.02.2025

Varinderdeep Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. D.S. Bhinder, Advocate
Mr. S.S. Sekhon, Advocate and
Ms. Indra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Adesh Pal Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
136	11.11.2024	Kotbhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib	118(1), 115(2), 191(3), 190 BNS, 2023 (Section 109 BNS 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 13 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:

“That the instant FIR No. 136 (supra) has been registered at the instance of complainant namely Gurveer Singh s/o Kulwinder Singh r/o Village Smagh, who is the injured victim of this case who stated that on 10-11-2024 at 7-00 PM, in connection with an earlier dispute with Amritpal Singh (co-accused) a meeting was held at the House of Amandeep Singh s/o Balwinder Singh where besides the accused persons namely i) Amritpal Singh, ii) Arjan Singh s/o Amritpal Singh, ii) Varinderdeep Singh (Petitioner), the persons namely Maan Singh s/o Harbans Singh, Kulwinder Singh s/o Sukhdev Singh, Harmeet Singh s/o Naib Singh, Chhota Singh s/o Gurdev Singh, Jasvir Singh s/o Sukhdev Singh, Mander Singh s/o

Sukhdev Singh, Iqbal Singh s/o Major Singh, Maha Singh s/o Maan Singh, Gurpreet Singh s/o Jasvir Singh, Jatinder Singh s/o Hardam Singh were present for the purpose of compromise. The complainant come at spot to call his father Kulwinder Singh. During talk i) Amritpal Singh ii) Arjan Singh and iii)Varinderdeep Singh (Petitioner) became furious and rushed to their Dezire car which was parked outside and came back with weapons. Arjan singh was armed with kappa, Varinderdeep Singh armed with kappa, Amritpal Singh holding a wooden haft accompanied with three unknown accomplice entered the courtyard of the house Amandeep Singh where the bulb was emitting light. The complainant tried to persuade the accused persons. Two unknown accomplice caught hold the complainant, whereas their third associate had caught hold his father. Co-accused Amritpal Singh gave a blow of his haft upon the complainant which hit on the back of his head. A blow of kappa was inflicted by co-accused Arjan Singh also hit at the back of head of complainant. Varinderdeep Singh (Petitioner) gave a blow of his kappa upon complainant which hit at the back of his head. Co-accused Amritpal Singh gave a blow of his haft upon the scapular region. Then co-accused Arjan Singh gave a blow with reverse side of his kappa which hit on the left side of his waist. On raising alarm, the accused fled away on their Car with respective weapons.”

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:

“6. That during investigation, the result of X-ray examination of victim was received and as per subsequent opinion the nature of injuries no.1 to 3 were declared simple in nature. The injury chart is given below for better appreciation the facts of the case:

<i>Injury No.</i>	<i>Seat of Injury</i>	<i>Attribution</i>	<i>Weapon</i>	<i>Nature</i>
<i>1.</i>	<i>Left region of Scalp</i>	<i>Amritpal Singh</i>	<i>Blunt</i>	<i>Simple</i>
<i>2.</i>	<i>Vertex of scalp</i>	<i>Arjan Singh</i>	<i>Sharp</i>	<i>Simple</i>
<i>3.</i>	<i>Occipital Region of scalp</i>	<i>Varinderdeep Singh (petitioner)</i>	<i>Sharp</i>	<i>Simple</i>
<i>4.</i>	<i>Waist Left side</i>	<i>Arjan Singh</i>	<i>Blunt</i>	<i>Simple</i>
<i>5.</i>	<i>Scapular</i>	<i>Amritpal Singh</i>	<i>Blunt</i>	<i>Simple</i>

Role of the petitioner and incriminating material:

7. That the name of present petitioner has found mention in FIR which was registered on the statement of injured victim and the present petitioner has been attributed specific role in causing him injuries with his Kappa on his head (Occipital Region of scalp). The petitioner along with co-accused had inflicted a number of injuries to the victim, especially upon his head. There was earlier dispute between the complainant and accused, so a meeting was held at the house of witness Amandeep Singh to resolve the matter, but the present petitioner along with his father Amritpal Singh, Arjan Singh and co-accused Gurjinder Singh and Gurpiar Singh came there with full preparation to cause injuries to the complainant and his father. The present petitioner is one of the prime accused of this case. Apart of the injured-complainant, there are other eye witness of the occurrence namely Amandeep Singh, Maan Singh, Kulwinder Singh who had unequivocally proved the culpability of petitioner. The injuries were caused in furtherance of common object of accused and therefore the petitioner is liable for a cumulative effect of assault upon victim, under the rule of vicarious liability.”

7. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been involved in a false and fabricated case. Petitioner was attributed a kappa blow and the injuries inflicted upon the person of complainant are not dangerous to life. An analysis of these submissions and the contents of FIR and reply points out that petitioner was holding a kappa and he inflicted blow on the occipital region of scalp of complainant. As per para no.6 of the reply, injury on the occipital region of scalp was attributed to petitioner but was found to be simple in nature. Although petitioner had inflicted injury on the head but it was simple which shows that less force was used. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner cannot be denied bail coupled with the fact that he is a first offender.

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, subject to the compliance of terms and conditions mentioned in this order.

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. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

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. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter the property, workplace, and residence of the victim until the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial are recorded. This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation, 2018 All SCR (Crl.) 458); and Aparna Bhatt v. The State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021:INSC:192, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

16. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the victim, and their family members, as well as the members of society, and

incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearm(s). [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days and inform the Investigator about the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and take it back in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible in the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

17. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

18. 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.

19. This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State shall file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall be at liberty to cancel this bail.

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

21. 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

CRM-M-65649-2024

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.

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

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

19.02.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.