



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

113

CRM-M-14514-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 16.03.2026

Manish Bhatt ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Mehul Khanna, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through video conferencing)

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.49 dated 12.04.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 109, 191(3), 190, 324(4) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Division No.1, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that the prosecution's version appears improbable, particularly because the alleged incident is stated to have occurred in an office located in a crowded area. It is further contended that although the complaint mentions that the complainant was threatened, no separate complaint regarding such threats was ever lodged. The injuries allegedly caused by the present petitioner are not life-



threatening, and the petitioner has clean antecedents. Accordingly, learned counsel prayed for the acceptance of the present petition.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner, along with the co-accused, attacked the office of the complainant and inflicted injuries upon the complainant's employee, Kulbir Singh, who sustained total 13 injuries. Out of these, six injuries i.e. Injury No.2,4,5,8,12 and 13 were caused by sharp-edged weapons and the present petitioner inflicted sickle blows on the arms and chest of Kulbir Singh. He further submitted that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to collect evidence for the successful prosecution of the case and for the recovery of the weapon of offence.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties, particularly the role attributed to the petitioner that he was armed with a 'Sickle (Datar)' and he, along with the co-accused, attacked the office of the complainant and inflicted injuries upon the complainant's employee, Kulbir Singh, who sustained total 13 injuries, out of which injury No.2,4,5,8,12 and 13 were caused by sharp-edged weapons and the petitioner is attributed sickle blows on the arms and chest of Kulbir Singh, this Court is of the view that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail, and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to collect evidence for the successful prosecution of the case and



for the recovery of the weapon of offence. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition.

7. While granting the relief of anticipatory bail, the Court is required to look beyond the offence in isolation and take into account the surrounding circumstances, including the impact of the crime on society, the likely effect of the grant of anticipatory bail on the societal interest, and the possibility of the accused indulging in similar illegal activities or otherwise impeding a fair investigation or the progress of the trial.

8. Anticipatory bail is an extraordinary relief, to be granted sparingly, only in exceptional cases deserving of the concession. The grant of such relief becomes even more circumscribed in cases involving serious offences as those alleged in the present case, especially where there is a grave apprehension or propensity of the applicant/petitioner to interfere with the course of law and prosecution of the case, either by committing similar offences, or threatening or influencing the witnesses.

9. Recently, Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Srikant Upadhyay v. State of Bihar, 2024 INSC 202***, has made the following observation with regard to concession of Anticipatory Bail:-

“We have already held that the power to grant anticipatory bail is an extraordinary power. Though in many cases it was held that bail is said to be a rule, it cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be said that anticipatory bail is the rule.... While called upon to exercise the said power, the Court concerned has to be very cautious as the grant of interim protection or protection to the accused in serious cases may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper the investigation to a



great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or distraction of the evidence.”

10. Moreover, as the investigation is still on-going, custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is necessary for effecting a proper and in-depth investigation in the case. Hon’ble Apex Court in ***State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187***, emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by anticipatory bail, wherein interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

11. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

12. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

16.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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