



105

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

CRM-M-18841-2026
DECIDED ON: 07.04.2026

HARPREET SINGH ALIAS HAPPU SINGH PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Sukhwinder Singh Dhillon, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under section 482 of BNSS (438 of Cr.P.C) praying for anticipatory bail to the Petitioner, in case, FIR No. 35 dated 03.03.2026, under sections 118(1), 115(2), 3(5), of BNS 2023, (corresponding to Sections 324, 323, 34 of IPC), [Section 117(2) of BNS (Section 325 of IPC) added later on], registered at Police Station, Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR was initially registered under Sections 118(1), 115(2), and 3(5) of the BNS. Upon filing an application for anticipatory bail, learned Additional Sessions Judge, vide order dated 17.03.2026, granted interim bail to the petitioner and directed him to join the investigation in respect of the said offences. The matter was adjourned to 25.03.2026 awaiting the report of the Investigating Officer.

3. Subsequently, petitioner came to know that an additional offence under Section 117(2) of the BNS has been incorporated in the present case, and since the interim bail order did not cover the said added offence, petitioner moved an application seeking amendment of the anticipatory bail application, to include Section 117(2) of the BNS. However, said application was dismissed by learned court, vide order dated 25.03.2026, without recording any finding that petitioner was unwilling to join the investigation.

4. It is further submitted that, as per the allegations, the alleged occurrence is stated to have taken place in the night of 28.02.2026; however, FIR came to be registered on 03.03.2026, i.e., after an unexplained delay of approximately three days. No plausible or satisfactory explanation has been furnished by the complainant for such an inordinate delay in lodging the FIR, which casts serious doubt on the veracity of the allegations and suggests that the story has been concocted with the sole intention of falsely implicating the petitioner in the present case.

It is further submitted that no specific weapon has been attributed to the petitioner, nor any injury is alleged to have been caused by him. Moreover, petitioner was not even present at the place of occurrence at the relevant time.

It is further submitted that petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to fully cooperate with the investigating agency, subject to being protected from arrest by this Court. Thus,

counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. Notice of motion.

6. On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, puts an appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and did not dispute the factual assertions made by counsel for the petitioner, and submits that Section 117(2) of BNS had indeed been added subsequently on 22.03.2026, and was not part of the FIR at the initial stage.

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

8. 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.).

9. 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.

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

07.04.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No