

2026:PHHC:038268



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-13762-2026

Date of decision: March 12, 2026

MUKHTIAR SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Tajinder Pal Singh Makkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Satjot Singh Chahal, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Abishai Alfred George, Advocate and
Mr. Archit Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The petition has been filed for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR no.0025, dated 14.02.2026, under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 190, 299, 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Moonak, District Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that all the offences the petitioner is accused of are bailable, except the one under Section 299 of the BNS (corresponding to Section 295-A of the IPC). The only allegation concerning it is that at about 4.30 p.m. the petitioner, one Satpal Singh and six or seven unknown persons came to Peer Baba Committee and used abusive language before the Peer Baba, due to which religious sentiments of members of the Committee were hurt. The allegations, even if taken to be true, do not constitute ingredients of the

alleged offence. He also contended that the petitioner himself was beaten up and his turban was removed in the scuffle; his statement to that effect dated 13.02.2026, Annexure P-4, was recorded by the police.

3. Learned State counsel, however, contended that the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge. But he misused the liberty by addressing a mass gathering in the Gurudwara Sahib concerning the facts of the case. He also extended threats to the persons so as to dissuade them from disclosing the facts regarding the incident to the Court and the police. Statedly, he gathered public for the purpose of exerting pressure on the police to cancel the FIR and that is the reason his bail application has been declined by the learned Judge vide order dated 05.03.2026.

4. Considering the submissions and looking at the conduct of the petitioner after he was granted interim bail by the Court, as recorded in the order dated 05.03.2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, this Court is not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

5. Dismissed.

March 12, 2026

Jaspreet Kaur

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)

JUDGE

✓

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*