



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-17452-2026
DECIDED ON: 01.04.2026

AMIT KAKKARPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHERRESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. A.P. Kaushal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Amit Kakkar, aged about 31 years	0034	25.02.2026	115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 191(3), 190, 351(2) of BNS (corresponding to sections 323, 324, 341, 148, 149, 506 IPC)	Dugri	Ludhiana

2. Complainant namely Gourav Tiwari, got the FIR registered alleging that on 24.02.2026 at about 4:00 P.M., he, along with his wife, Ritika Chakraborty, had gone to meet his friend, Gaurav Kumar and their

vehicle, Thar bearing registration No.PB-10-KA-3497, was parked in the market parking area.

It is further alleged that at about 6:00 P.M., when they were coming out of their friend's office, two vehicles—one Thar, bearing registration No.PB-37-K-6264 and another black car, Kia Sonet—arrived, carrying 7–8 unknown persons along with Amit Kakkar (present petitioner).

3. Upon seeing the complainant, petitioner allegedly struck a blow on his head with a sharp-edged weapon, and all the accused persons collectively inflicted multiple injuries on the complainant's head. When the complainant's wife intervened, she was also threatened by the accused persons.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present case is false in nature and petitioner has no connection with the alleged incident.

It is further submitted that, in fact, due to injuries inflicted by 7–8 persons upon the petitioner and his brother-Harsh Kakkar, FIR No.0070 dated 19.06.2024 had already been registered under Sections 458, 323, 324, 148, 149, and 506 IPC at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, District Ludhiana.

5. It is argued that present FIR has been lodged as a counterblast to the said FIR No.0070 and also with the intent to pressurize the petitioner not to depose in the earlier case registered against the complainant party. It is further contended that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner. Moreover, petitioner is ready

to join the investigation and fully cooperate, if protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, counsel prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. Notice of motion.

7. On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State.

8. On being asked by this Court, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Surjeet Singh, submits that all the injuries attributed to the petitioner, have been opined to be simple in nature.

9. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available on file.

10. In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find it necessary to keep the present petition pending any further and, accordingly, deems it appropriate to dispose of the same, with the direction to the petitioner to join the investigation within two weeks from today or as and when called by the investigating officer, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

11. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

12. However, it shall be open to the prosecution as well as the complainant to seek revival of the present bail order, in the event that statements made by learned counsel for the petitioner, as recorded here above, are found to be incorrect, or if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigation, in terms of the directions mentioned in the present order.

13. With the directions recorded here above, present petition stands disposed of.

01.04.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>