



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.106

CRM-M-13494-2026
Date of Decision: 12.03.2026

KARAN SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. T.P. Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present is the first petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 / under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 148 dated 07.11.2025, registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 126(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, and later on added under Sections 117(2) and 117(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (as per IPC under Sections 307, 323, 341, 506, 148, 149 and 325 IPC and Section 117(4) BNS newly added) at Police Station Chhajli, District Sangrur.
2. The brief facts of the case are that the criminal law was set into motion on the basis of the statement of complainant Kamaljit Singh, who alleged that on 05.11.2025 at about 7:30 A.M., when he reached near the crossing of the Co-operative Society, accused Sukhwant Singh alias Banta armed with an iron rod and Devinder Singh armed with an iron rod came in front of his motorcycle and stopped him. Thereafter, Gagandeep Singh armed with an iron pipe, Harshdeep Singh alias Harsh armed with an iron



rod, Dilpreet Singh alias Kaila armed with an iron rod and two unknown persons arrived in a Swift car from behind and surrounded him. It is further alleged that Dilpreet Singh exhorted the co-accused to teach the complainant a lesson for earlier fights. In the meantime, Dilpreet Singh allegedly gave an iron rod blow towards the head of the complainant with an intention to kill him, which struck his left arm when he tried to save himself. Thereafter, the other accused persons allegedly gave blows with iron rods and iron pipes on different parts of his body including his knees, legs and feet. On hearing the cries of the complainant, his wife and other people gathered at the spot, upon which the accused fled from the spot along with their weapons while extending threats. The complainant was thereafter taken to Civil Hospital, Sangrur from where he was referred to PGI. It is further alleged that the motive behind the occurrence was an earlier quarrel between the complainant and Dilpreet Singh in December, 2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that in the present case the petitioner has been nominated after about 10 days of the alleged occurrence. It is further submitted that the only role attributed to the petitioner is that in the CCTV footage, he is allegedly seen inflicting an injury on the right foot of the injured, which has resulted in a fracture. It is contended that at the most, the allegations against the petitioner would attract the offence under Section 325 IPC/Section 117 (2) BNS as the weapon attributed to the petitioner is an iron rod and the alleged injury caused by him has resulted in grievous hurt. It is further submitted that the said offence is bailable in nature and the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency. On these



grounds, prayer has been made that the petitioner be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and contests the present bail application. It is submitted by the learned State counsel that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, who along with the other co-accused caused multiple injuries to the injured. It is further submitted that the injured has suffered as many as seven injuries and the same were inflicted with an intention to kill him, thereby attracting the offence under Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita/Section 307 IPC. It is further argued that the injured has also received grievous injuries and the petitioner has been specifically seen in the CCTV footage inflicting an injury which resulted in a fracture to the injured. Therefore, it is submitted that keeping in view the seriousness of the allegations and the role attributed to the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record. The allegations in the present case reveal that the petitioner along with the other co-accused allegedly attacked the injured with deadly weapons including iron rods and pipes. The injured has suffered multiple injuries and one of the injuries attributed to the present petitioner has resulted in a fracture, which clearly indicates the gravity of the assault. The CCTV footage placed on record *prima facie* shows the involvement of the petitioner in the occurrence and his active participation in causing injuries to the injured. The nature of the allegations, the manner in which the



occurrence has taken place, and the number of injuries suffered by the injured *prima facie* suggest that the attack was not a sudden or trivial incident but a serious assault carried out by several accused persons acting in concert.

7. Further, the investigation in the present case is still at a crucial stage and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be required for the purpose of unearthing the complete sequence of events and the role of all the accused persons involved in the occurrence. Grant of anticipatory bail at this stage may hamper the fair investigation of the case. The seriousness of the offence, the specific role attributed to the petitioner in the CCTV footage, and the grievous injury caused to the injured are all factors which disentitle the petitioner from the grant of anticipatory bail.

8. Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the allegations, the role attributed to the petitioner and the material collected during investigation, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for granting the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

12.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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