

CRM-M-4614-2026

2026:PHHC:048967



**203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-4614-2026

Date of decision: March 30, 2026

Gursewak Sharma alias Shabby

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”), the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 209 dated 30.11.2025 under Sections 109, 115(2), 303(2), 191(3), 238 and 190 of the BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station City-1, Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2. On 12.03.2026, following order had been passed: -

“Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case

CRM-M-4614-2026

FIR No.209 dated 30.11.2025 registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 303(2), 191(3), 238 and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station City-1, District Sangrur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. He further submitted that the petitioner was not even present on the spot at the time of commission of offence. He argued that the alleged occurrence took place on 18.11.2025 but the FIR in question was registered on 30.11.2025 i.e. after an unexplained delay of 12 days, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He further argued that even MLR of the complainant was got conducted on 29.11.2025 i.e. too after a delay of 11 days from the alleged occurrence, which again creates doubt on the veracity of the prosecution version. He argued that if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, even then no specific role has been attributed to the present petitioner. He further argued that Section 109 of BNS was added by the prosecution only to make the offence graver. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, he has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature.

Adjourned to 30.03.2026.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to join investigation within a week from today and would appear as and when required by the Investigating Officer and cooperate with the Investigating Agency. In the event of arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on

CRM-M-4614-2026

furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order dated 12.03.2026 passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the State, on instructions, has submitted that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the interim order dated 12.03.2026 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

March 30, 2026
Rts

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No