



CRM-M-68785-2025

-1-

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

109

CRM-M-68785-2025 (O&M)

Decided on: 08.12.2025

JEEVAN SINGH @ HARJEEVAN SINGH**.....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Yagsimant Attri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.120 dated 13.10.2025 under Sections 110, 115(2), 351(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Bareta, District Mansa, Punjab.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 10.10.2025, at about 8:30 p.m., the accused who are neighbours of the complainant namely, Shinda Singh, Kali Singh, Jeevan Singh (the present petitioner) sons of Ramphal Singh, Ramphal Singh and Chhota Singh, armed with *Dangs* and *Sotis*, were raising *lalkaras*, upon hearing the noise, the complainant and his brother-Hardam Singh (residing in a separate house) came out of their houses. When the complainant and his brother Hardam Singh asked for reason(s) for abusing and raising *lalkaras*, they did not listen to them and

Shinda Singh inflicted an axe blow on the head of the complainant's



brother-Hardam Singh with an intention to kill him and Chhota Singh inflicted an iron pipe blow on the left leg of Hardam Singh. When complainant tried to stop them, Kali Singh inflicted a *Dang* blow on his shoulder. Thereafter, Ramphal Singh inflicted *Dang* blow on the right arm of his brother Hardam Singh. Jeevan Singh (the present petitioner) inflicted a *Dang* blow on his left shoulder. Thereafter, on raising alarms, many persons gathered at the spot and the present petitioner along with other co-accused ran away from the spot with their respective weapons.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that it is a case of version and cross version and on the version of the present petitioner, DDR No.29 dated 16.10.2025 is registered against the complainant party and both the parties are neighbours. The offences in the present FIR are triable by the Magistrate and the maximum punishment for the alleged offences provided under the relevant provisions of law is 07 years; the petitioner is having clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case except the present case. It is also contended that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. He however does not dispute the fact that alleged offences qua the present petitioner, are triable by the Magistrate and the maximum sentence for the said offences is upto 07 years. He also did not controvert the fact that the petitioner is having clean antecedents.



CRM-M-68785-2025

-3-

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions made by learned counsel for the parties, that offences in the present FIR are triable by the Magistrate and the maximum punishment for the alleged offences provided under the relevant provisions of law is 07 years; the petitioner is having clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case except the present case; the petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and as the offences in the present case are punishable upto 07 years so, the Investigating Officer is directed to follow the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar and Another (2014), 8 SCC 273* and *Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI, (2022) 10 SCC 51*.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

08.12.2025*Sonia Puri*

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO

Whether Reportable: YES/NO