

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026PHHC:038834



(214)

CRM-M-5864-2026
Decided on: 12.03.2026
Uploaded on: 13.03.2026

Harpreet Singh @ Ladi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Gill, Advocate for the petitioner (s).
Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail in the case arising out of FIR No.281 dated 16.12.2025, registered under Sections 333, 115(2), 190, 191(3), and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), at Police Station City Moga, District Moga.

2. On 02.02.2026, the following order was passed:

“The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short

'BNSS') by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail in the case arising out of FIR No.281 dated 16.12.2025, registered under Sections 333, 115(2), 190, 191(3), and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), at Police Station City Moga, District Moga.

The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a statement got recorded by the complainant-Manmeet Singh, on 16.12.2025, alleging that on 14.12.2025, the petitioner along with the co-accused- Sharanpreet Singh had come to the shop of his father and insisted upon getting some repair work of his car done. Upon refusal by his father, they left the spot and thereafter returned after some time, accompanied by the co-accused and assaulted the complainant, thereby causing injuries to him.

After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail, which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga, vide order dated 24.12.2025.

It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. There is a delay of two days in the registration of the FIR, which has not been explained. The injuries sustained by the victim have been opined to be simple in nature. It is highly improbable that the injury, which is alleged to have been inflicted by the petitioner with baseball bat, could be opined as simple. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. It is, therefore, submitted that the petition deserves to be allowed.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, learned Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to file reply.

Adjourned to 09.03.2026.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the Investigating/Arresting Officer to join investigation within 10 days as and when required. In the event of his arrest, the Investigating/Arresting Officer shall release the petitioner on interim bail on furnishing personal/surety bonds to his/her

satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023. It would, however, be open to the learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab to file a reply indicating the involvement of the petitioner and all aspects would be considered at the time of final adjudication of the matter.”

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation but his custodial interrogation is required for effecting the recovery of vehicle alleged to have been used & whereabouts of other accused.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record; especially keeping in view the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation & cooperated therein and his custodial interrogation being sought for recovery of vehicle alleged to have been used & whereabouts of other accused; this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 02.02.2026.

5. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

7. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

12.03.2026

Naveen

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No