

S. No.107

2025:PHHC:172022



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

**CRM-M-69263 of 2025
Date of Decision:09.12.2025**

Jasbir Singh @ Jasvir Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Sukhwinder Singh Kainth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jatinderpal Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab and
Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Aman Mittal, Advocate for the complainant.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.69 dated 15.06.2025 registered at Police Station Daba, District Ludhiana, under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 332(c), 191(3), 190, 351(3) and 118(2) of BNS, 2023 (Section 118(2) of BNS, 2023 added later on).

2. Upon notice, learned State Counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant have appeared. Vakalatnama filed on behalf of the complainant is taken on record. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the material placed on record.

3. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by Rajpal s/o Harbans Lal with the allegations that he is a transporter and



on 14.06.2025 at about 8:45 PM, his nephew Sukhwinder Pal was returning to house from Pamma Market on his Aactiva and when he reached near Jain's liquor shop, one auto rickshaw being driven by one Jasvir Singh (petitioner) hit the Aactiva of his nephew and they got into an argument. Said Jasvir Singh called his brother Jagroop Singh and one unknown person and all of them caused injuries to his nephew and thereafter, his nephew returned to his house and narrated the incident to him. In the meanwhile, Nihang Mithu Baba, Nihang Satta Baba and their relatives namely Nihang Shera and Nihang Jaspal Baba along with 4-5 other unknown persons came to their house. Jasvir Singh (petitioner) was armed with an iron gandasa, Jagroop Singh was armed with iron sword, Nihang Mithu Baba was armed with iron gandasa, Nihang Satta Baba was armed with an iron sword and Nihang Shera was armed with stick while unknown persons were also armed with sticks and swords and they all started quarreling with them. Nihang Mithu Baba was known to him since a long time and he tried to counsel him, but it was of no help. In the meanwhile, his nephew Sukhwinder Pal and his elder brother Baldev Raj and one neighbour Shekhar also came there and tried to pacify them. Thereafter, Nihang Mithu Baba gave a gandasa blow towards his head and when he tried to defend himself by putting his left arm forward, the first blow hit on his wrist of the left arm and then he hit him with the gandasa towards his head and when he brought forward his left hand to protect himself, he hit his left bicep. Jagroop Singh gave iron sword blow towards his head, which hit him his forehead and he started bleeding. Nihag Satta Baba caused a blow with iron sword from its reverse side in the head of his son Gurjit Sharma and he also raised his right hand



to protect himself and the sword hit his elbow joint. Thereafter, Jasvir Singh (petitioner) gave three blows with gandasa stick to his son Gurjit Sharma, which hit his back and wrist of his right arm. Jasvir Singh caused blow with gandasa stick to his nephew Sukhwinder Pal on the ankle of his left leg and left arm and thereafter, they were taken to the hospital for treatment and he sought action against the assailants.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The injury caused with sharp weapon which has been declared to be grievous is not attributed to the applicant. Only simple injuries are attributed to the petitioner. Another co-accused namely Satnam Singh @ Nihang Satta Baba to whom simple injuries were attributed has already been released on ad-interim anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 12.08.2025 in CRM-M-42102-2025 (Annexure P-3) which has been subsequently made absolute by this Court. Learned counsel contended that petitioner is also ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail may be extended in his favour.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail and argued that the case of petitioner is different from that of co-accused Satnam Singh @ Nihang Satta Baba, who has been granted benefit of ad-interim anticipatory bail. Infact, petitioner initially had a quarrel with the son of the complainant in the market and he had inflicted injuries to him and victim returned to his house. Thereafter, petitioner along with several



persons came to the house of the complainant armed with deadly weapons and assaulted the complainant, his brother and son and one of the victim has suffered grievous injuries which have been caused with a gandas blow. Petitioner too had caused gandas blows to Gurjit Sharma who is son of the complainant on his back and waist and one blow to the nephew of the complainant namely Sukhwinder Pal. The petitioner is thus the main culprit who instigated the remaining accused persons in launching the attack after coming to the house of the complainant. The weapon of offence is yet to be recovered for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is thus essential and he does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail.

6. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. A minor altercation had taken place between the nephew of the complainant and petitioner Jasvir Singh when their vehicles collided on the road. Thereafter, petitioner along with several persons came to the house of complainant armed with deadly weapons including gandas, sword and lathis etc. and assaulted them. One of the victim namely Rajpal has suffered grievous injury, which has been caused with a sharp weapon. Petitioner too has inflicted gandas blows on the person of Gurjit Sharma on his back and wrist of his right arm as well as to Sukhwinder Pal on his left leg and left arm. The weapon of offence is yet to be recovered, for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential. The investigation is at initial stage and grant of anticipatory will rather hamper the investigation and in case, petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, he may influence the investigation or even try to intimidate or win over the witnesses.



7. Taking into consideration the gravity of offence and the fact that weapon of offence is yet to be recovered, petitioner does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail. Resultantly, the present petition is hereby dismissed.
8. Pending misc. application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

December 09, 2025
renu

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