



CRM-M-14970 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-14970 of 2026
Date of Decision: 20.04.2026

Vikram Singh @ Bikram Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. J.S. Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amrit Kaur Mahir, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Shivani Jaglan, Advocate, for
Mr. Mayur Karkra, Advocate
for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.101 dated 27.09.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 190, 191(3), 126(2) and 281 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Sections 117(2) and 110 of BNS added later on), at Police Station Ghagga, District Patiala.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused, armed with deadly weapons, attacked the complainant and other persons and caused injuries to them. Hence, the present FIR.



CRM-M-14970 of 2026 **-2-**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. He argued that the alleged occurrence took place on 26.09.2025 but the FIR in question was registered on 27.09.2025 i.e. after a delay of 01 day, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He further argued that it was co-accused Surinder Singh, who gave iron blow on the head of Hansvir Singh, which has been declared grievous in nature. He further argued that if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, even then the injury attributed to the present petitioner is on the non-vital part of the body of the injured Jagseer Singh. He further argued that Section 117(2) of BNS has been added later on, only to make the offence graver. No recovery is to be effected from him. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala, vide order dated 05.03.2026.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, she has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She argued that the petitioner in connivance with other co-accused has attacked the complainant and other persons and there is specific attribution against



CRM-M-14970 of 2026 **-3-**

the petitioner that he inflicted injuries with *gandasi* on the head of injured Bhola Singh and on the legs of Jagsir Singh. She further argued that the injury inflicted by him upon Bhola Singh is stated to be blunt, on vital part of his body and medical opinion qua the same is pending. She further submitted that the petitioner is involved in one more case meaning thereby he is a habitual offender. She further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair and proper investigation in the matter, to recover the weapon of offence and identification and arrest of co-accused. Hence, she prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant, while opposing the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. Heard.

8. In the present case, the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and the allegations against him are serious in nature. He is alleged to have inflicted grievous injuries upon the injured persons is stated to be on the vital part of body of Bhola Singh i.e. head. The weapon of offence is yet to be recovered. This Court is sanguine of the fact that while considering the petition for anticipatory bail, it is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusation against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering



CRM-M-14970 of 2026 -4-

the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

9. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wider impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."



CRM-M-14970 of 2026 **-5-**

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

20.04.2026
D.Bansal

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