



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.213

CRM-M-15498-2026
Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

AMANDEEP SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 24 dated 28.01.2026 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 351(1), 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 (Sections 323, 324, 503, 506, 148, 149 of IPC, 1860), registered at Police Station Division No. 8, Jalandhar.

2. In brief, the facts of the case are that the present FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant, who alleged that upon a dispute, he was attacked by the accused persons armed with sharp-edged weapons and base bats. The accused allegedly inflicted multiple injuries upon him, including blows with a dattar on different parts of his body, resulting in bleeding injuries, whereafter the assailants fled from the spot. The injured was thereafter taken to the hospital for treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that



the only injury attributed to the petitioner is on the right arm of the complainant, which is a non-vital part of the body, and therefore, no case for custodial interrogation is made out. It is further submitted that the injuries are superficial in nature and the petitioner is ready to join investigation, thus he deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that as many as nine injuries have been suffered by the complainant. It is further contended that injury No.3, which is a deep incised wound on the right forearm, has been specifically attributed to the present petitioner. The said injury was subjected to radiological examination and, as per the medical opinion, the same has been declared grievous in nature, thereby attracting the offence punishable under Section 326 IPC. It is thus argued that keeping in view the nature and number of injuries and the specific role attributed to the petitioner, he is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The record reveals that the complainant sustained as many as nine injuries in the occurrence and the injury attributed to the petitioner is not merely simple in nature, rather injury No.3, attributed specifically to him, has been opined to be grievous after radiological examination. The same attracts the rigours of Section 326 IPC, which relates to voluntarily causing grievous hurt by dangerous weapons. The petitioner is alleged to have been armed with a sharp-edged weapon i.e. dattar and to have inflicted the said injury. The



nature of weapon used and the manner of assault clearly reflect the gravity of the offence. The argument that the injury is on a non-vital part of the body does not dilute the seriousness of the act, particularly when the injury has been declared grievous in nature by the medical expert.

7. So far as the plea of parity is concerned, the same is not available to the petitioner. The co-accused namely Priya, Raja and Varun, who have been granted bail, stand on a different footing, as the grievous injury attracting Section 326 IPC has been specifically attributed to the present petitioner. Thus, his role is distinct and more serious.

8. Considering the nature of allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, the fact that a grievous injury with a sharp-edged weapon has been caused by him, and the requirement of custodial interrogation, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

9. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

10. However, nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

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

01.04.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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