In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

219

CRM-M-2596-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 10.02.2026

Nimmi Singh @ Rupinder Singh … Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Rajat Dogra, Advocate with
Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

*****

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.116 dated 27.08.2024, registered under Sections 458, 323, 506, 427, 148, 149 of IPC, 1860, at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has neither committed the alleged offence nor inflicted any injuries, nor entered the house of the complainant as alleged. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner. It is thus prayed that the petitioner be granted the concession of anticipatory bail, as he is ready and willing to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

GEETA RANI
2026.02.24 17:27
I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this order/judgment
Punjab & Haryana High Court at Chandigarh

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, has put in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State and opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner actively participated in the commission of the offence. It is alleged that he, along with other co-accused, forcibly entered in the house of the complainant and inflicted several injuries upon the complainant's husband with the intention to kill him. It is further submitted that the petitioner, along with his co-accused, damaged the household articles of the complainant, caused injuries to the complainant and her family members, and demolished the wall of their neighbours. In view of seriousness of allegations and active participation of petitioner in commission of offence, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of present bail petition.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and contentions of learned counsel for the parties, particularly the fact that the petitioner actively participated in the commission of offence, and the manner in which the offence has been committed, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for complete and effective investigation.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as '***CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806' decided on 03.08.1997,*** by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in

GEETA RANI
2026.02.24 17:27
I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this order/judgment
Punjab & Haryana High Court at Chandigarh

custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

10.02.2026
Geeta

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No

GEETA RANI
2026.02.24 17:27
I attest to the accuracy and authenticity of this order/judgment
Punjab & Haryana High Court at Chandigarh