



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
203

CRM-M-12371-2026
Decided on : 16.04.2026

Sukhpal Singh alias Kala . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. N.S. Dandiwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, Sr. DAG, Punjab
assisted by SHO Shamsheer Singh.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sukhpal Singh alias Kala, aged about 27 years	147	21.08.2025	118(2), 115(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 [corresponding Sections 326, 323, 148, 149 of IPC]	Kamboj	Amritsar

2. In the present case, on 19.03.2026, following order was passed by this Court:-

“2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that only simple injuries on the left forearm of the injured have been attributed to the petitioner and that he was allegedly armed with a wooden stick. It is further submitted that the injuries attributed to the petitioner are simple in nature. Learned counsel further submits that there is an unexplained delay of 24 days in lodging the FIR. It is also contended that



anticipatory bail has already been granted to co-accused Mangal Singh and Bikramjit Singh and thus, the case of the petitioner is on parity with them. Accordingly, it is prayed that the petitioner be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

3. *On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the present bail petition on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled in the present case. It is submitted that the injured has received injuries attracting offence under Section 326 IPC, which have been attributed to co-accused Sunil.*

4. *I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.*

5. *Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, particularly the delay in lodging the FIR, the attribution of simple injury on a non-vital part of the body to the petitioner, and the fact that the co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail, the case of the petitioner stands on parity with co-accused Bikramjit Singh @ Soni, this Court is of the view that the petitioner deserves the concession of interim bail.*

6. *Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on interim bail subject to his joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer concerned within one week from today, on furnishing of personal/security bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.*

7. *List on 16.04.2026.”*

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 19.03.2026, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation on 25.03.2026 by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial



interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 19.03.2026, passed by this Court is hereby made **absolute**.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, petition stands **disposed of**, accordingly.

8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 16, 2026

J.Ram

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