



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

102

CRM-M-17512-2026

Date of Decision:08.04.2026

VANSHDEEP SINGH @ VANSH AND OTHERS PETITIONERS**VS****STATE OF PUNJAB****.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON**

Present:- Mr. G.S. Simble, Advocate
 for the petitioners.

 Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.77 dated 07.03.2026, under Sections 74, 115(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS (Sections 354, 324, 148, 149 IPC), registered at Police Station Civil Lines Batala, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur, wherein the allegations are that the accused in furtherance of their common intention, caused injuries to the complainant and outraged her modesty.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the impugned order passed by the Court below declining anticipatory bail is unsustainable in law. It is submitted that the allegations, even if taken at their face value, pertain to a scuffle arising out of a personal dispute relating to demand of alleged salary dues of the complainant's husband. It is further argued that as per the medical record, all the injuries suffered by the complainant are simple in nature. Learned counsel has also drawn the



attention of this Court to the fact that the specific allegation of tearing of clothes, which is stated to have led to outraging of modesty, has been attributed to a co-accused woman, namely Manjinder Kaur. It is thus contended that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required and they are willing to join the investigation.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the petition and submits that the allegations are serious in nature and the complainant has specifically named the petitioners in her statement recorded during investigation. He, however, fairly submits, on instructions, that as per the medical record, all the injuries suffered by the complainant are simple in nature. It is further submitted that the investigation is still in progress and the challan has not yet been presented and, therefore, in case the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail, they may influence the witnesses or hamper the investigation.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

5. At the outset, it is to be noted that the power under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is to be exercised keeping in view the nature and gravity of the accusation, the role attributed to the accused and the necessity of custodial interrogation.

6. In the present case, the injuries attributed to the complainant are stated to be simple in nature, which fact has also been fairly conceded by learned State counsel. No grievous injury has been alleged. The occurrence appears to have arisen out of a personal dispute relating to demand of salary dues, which *prima facie* gives the matter a flavour of a localized altercation rather than a premeditated criminal act. So far as the allegation regarding



outraging the modesty of the complainant is concerned, the specific role of tearing of clothes has been attributed to a co-accused, who is a woman.

7. Without commenting upon the merits of the said allegation, which shall be examined during trial, this Court finds that the role attributed to the present petitioners does not, at this stage, necessitate their custodial interrogation.

8. The State has not been able to point out any specific circumstance requiring custodial interrogation of the petitioners. The apprehension that they may influence the investigation can be adequately addressed by imposing suitable conditions.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on anticipatory bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and shall fully cooperate with the investigation. They shall not tamper with the evidence or influence any witness and shall abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

10. It is clarified that nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

08.04.2026
pry

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No