



CRM-M-12013 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216/2

CRM-M-12013 of 2026
Date of Decision: 07.04.2026

Priyanshu Kumar alias Vishal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. S.S. Kalra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Shukla, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate
for respondent No.2/complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.14 dated 15.01.2026 registered under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 351(3), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Section 117(4) of the BNS is added later on), at Police Station Sahnewal, District Ludhiana.
2. Brief facts as per the case of the prosecution are that the petitioner along with co-accused, attacked the complainant and caused serious injuries to him, due to some old enmity. Hence, the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that the

**CRM-M-12013 of 2026 -2-**

alleged occurrence took place on 11.01.2026 but the FIR in question was registered on 15.01.2026 i.e. after an unexplained delay of 04 days, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He argued that the present FIR was registered by the complainant for the reason that the petitioner was earlier employed with M/s Radha Agro Factory and left job on 12.09.2024 to start his own business in the same field. The complainant being Manager of the said firm, became annoyed and falsely roped the petitioner in the present case. He argued that the petitioner was not even present on the spot at the time of commission of offence. He further argued that if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, even then the injury attributed to the petitioner is on the non-vital part of the body of complainant i.e. on his leg. He further argued that Section 115(2) of BNS has been added by the prosecution, only to make the offence graver. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case and nothing is to be recovered from him. 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.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, vide order dated 25.02.2026.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, he has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the



CRM-M-12013 of 2026 **-3-**

allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR. He further argued that the petitioner along with co-accused, armed with deadly weapons, attacked the complainant and caused serious injuries to him. He submitted that the petitioner along with co-accused took turn holding the baseball bat and repeatedly struck the complainant on his legs, as a result whereof the complainant fell on the ground. He further submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair and proper investigation in the matter, to recover the weapon of offence, for unfolding the complete facts of the occurrence and for ascertaining the role of other co-accused in the conspiracy behind the occurrence. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant adopts the submissions made by learned State counsel and while opposing the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, has contended that in the said occurrence, the complainant remained in the hospital for 14 days and moreover, he cannot even walk without human support. He submitted that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. Heard.

8. In the present case, the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and the allegations against him as per reply filed by State are specific and serious in nature. The petitioner along with co-accused is alleged to have inflicted grievous injuries upon the complainant due to previous enmity. The complainant suffered a lot and was hospitalized for 14 days and as per



CRM-M-12013 of 2026 -4-

complainant's counsel, he still requires human assistance to walk. The weapon of offence is yet to be recovered. This Court is sanguine of the fact that while considering the petition for anticipatory bail, it is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusation against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

9. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wider impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and



CRM-M-12013 of 2026

-5-

insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

07.04.2026*D.Bansal*

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