

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

105

CRM-M-13864-2026 (O&M)

Sandeep Singh Aasht alias Sandeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

105-II

CRM-M-13980-2026 (O&M)

Kewal Masih

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

Date of Decision:- 13.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Parambir Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Bhawanjot Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of the above mentioned both these petitions filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners arising of out a case bearing FIR No.223 dated 09.11.2024, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 126(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Dasuya, Hoshiarpur.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that a dispute exists between the complainant and the petitioners. Earlier, Rapat No.28



dated 24.10.2024 was recorded against the complainant regarding injuries allegedly caused to the father-in-law of petitioner Sandeep Singh Aasht @ Sandeep Singh; however, no action was taken thereon. It is further submitted that the present FIR has been registered as a counterblast to the said complaint and that no such incident as alleged in the FIR had actually occurred. The allegations against the petitioner are concocted one, which is evident from the 14 days delay in lodging of FIR. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioners have clean antecedents, are not involved in any other criminal activity, and that the offences alleged are triable by a Magistrate. Accordingly, learned counsel prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, submitting that they are ready and willing to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Anup Singh, learned AAG, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposed the bail petition by submitting that the petitioners have been specifically named in the present FIR and are alleged to have caused four injuries with sharp-edged weapons, out of which one injury has been declared grievous in nature. Petitioner-Sandeep Singh was armed with 'Kirch'; petitioner-Kewal Masih was armed with 'daat'. However, it is not disputed that the said injury was inflicted on a non-vital part of the body, i.e. right foot. As per the material available on record, it is also not disputed that the petitioners have clean antecedents and are not involved in any other case except the present one. Learned State counsel fairly admitted that the maximum punishment prescribed for the offences alleged is up to seven years.



CRM-M-13864-2026 (O&M) and
CRM-M-13980-2026 (O&M) (3)

5. Heard.
6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and contentions of learned counsel for the parties; allegations against the present petitioners have caused injuries with sharp edged weapons to the petitioner; the injuries are on non-vital part; the offences are triable by Magistrate; the maximum punishment for the offences alleged is 07 years, the petitioners have clean and clear antecedents; and they are not involved in any other criminal activity; hence, both these petitions are disposed of with a direction to the petitioners to join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer. The Investigating Officer is directed to follow the directions of the *Hon’ble Supreme Court in Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar and Another (2014), 8 SCC 273* and *Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI, (2022) 10 SCC 51*.
7. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case.
8. A copy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

13.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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