



CRM-M-19250-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

106

**CRM-M-19250-2026
Decided on: 09.04.2026**

SARABJIT SINGH**.....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Inderjeet Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Rajat Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.76 dated 09.06.2026, under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 (Sections 109, 110 of BNS added later on) registered at Police Station Kalanaur, District Gurdaspu, Punjab. (Annexure P-1).

2. Briefly stated, the present case has been registered on the complaint of Sukhwinder Singh that on 02.06.2025, while he was present on the roof of his house, Sarabjit Singh alias Sabi (the present petitioner), Sucha Singh and Diljaan Singh were measuring and marking his land in front of his house with tape upon which he asked them loudly as to what they were doing in his land. Thereafter, he got down from his roof and went to his land and all the three persons fled away from the spot and entered the house of Gurdev Singh, next to their house. While the



complainant was standing in front of his house, Sarabjit Singh alias Sabhi (the present petitioner) armed with *datar*, Sucha Singh and Diljaan Singh armed with *dangs* and two unknown persons came out from the house of Gurdev Singh and ran towards him. Sucha Singh raised *lalkara* to catch hold of him as he/complainant was preventing them from occupying the land. Sarabjit Singh alias Sabi (the present petitioner) gave two *datar* blows upon him which hit on left side of his head. Then Diljaan Singh gave a *dang* blow which hit on his left ankle. He raised alarm and his brother Jaswant Singh came to the spot. Thereafter, all the aforesaid accused persons fled away alongwith their respective weapons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present petition and has not caused any injury; there is a delay of 07 days in registration of the present FIR as the incident occurred on 02.06.2025; the complainant was initially admitted in Abrol Hospital, District Gurdaspur on 03.06.2025 whereupon MLR was prepared by Medical Officer, Civil Hospital Kalanaur, District Gurdaspur and all injuries were found to be simple in nature, however, the petitioner was later on shifted to a private hospital in order to obtain favourable result of alleged injuries; that the injured has procured false MLR and injury no.1 does not fall within the ambit of grievous injury and is not dangerous to life; the co-accused namely Sucha Singh and Diljaan Singh have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 03.02.2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur (Annexure P-3); the petitioner is ready to join the



investigation and as such, prayed for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposes the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts & circumstances of the present case, the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties and the allegations levelled against the present petitioner that he was armed with a deadly weapon and has given two blows which hit on the head of the injured-complainant and there is a cranium fracture (skull fracture) to the complainant; the moot question with regard to delay of 07 days in filing of the present FIR or the nature of injury(ies) caused to the complainant-injured, is to be adjudicated upon by the trial Court at an appropriate stage after appreciating the evidence adduced by the parties, hence, at this stage, the petitioner is not entitled for discretionary relief as prayed for, as the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for thorough investigation in the matter.

8. In *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful information and



CRM-M-19250-2026 (O&M) -4-

concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. In view of above, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same is hereby **dismissed**.

10. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

09.04.2026
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO