



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101-1

CRM-M-22606-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 24.04.2026

Ashwani Khairwal

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Ms. Ishiqa Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Kanwar Kirat Singh Puti, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This is first petition filed for grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.183 dated 12.08.2025 registered under Sections 109, 118(2), 61(2), 191(3), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Sadar, Ludhiana.

2. The present FIR has been registered on the statement of Vishal Jhanalia to the effect that on Holi eve, he had a small quarrel with his neighbour Mandeep Bhot which was later compromised. However, he kept nurturing a grudge for the same. On 09.08.2025 at about 09.30pm, Manraj, Tarun and Mandeep Singh came to complainant's house to celebrate Raksha Bandhan. After the festivities, they had gone together to a Burger stall near his house, where Mandeep Bhot @ Sajan, his younger brother alongwith Kaka, Ashwani, Ravi, Prince, Sahib, Mukesh and Ibrahim Khan, armed with deadly weapons, came there and attacked upon them. Kaka gave datar blow

on complainant's head while Prince gave base-ball blow on his back. Manraj and Ashwani alongwith Kallu attacked upon him by means of datar. Ravi and Mukesh gave datar blows on his person due to which he sustained injuries in his left hand. Sahil attacked upon his friend Mandeep Singh while Mandeep Bhot @ Sajan and Ibrahim gave Kirpan and datar blows on his body parts.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has not been attributed any specific role or injury and the injury on the head is infact attributed to co-accused/Kallu. She submits that similarly placed two co-accused i.e. Mukesh Kumar and Ravi Khairwal have already been granted the concession of pre-arrest bail by this Court vide separate orders dated 04.11.2025 and 13.02.2026 passed by this Court. It is further argued that the motive behind the incident is attributed to co-accused/Mandeep Bhot @ Sajan, who was nursing a grudge against the complainant over a prior quarrel between the parties. Hence, the petitioner has no reason to participate in the commission of the offence or to inflict any injury on the complainant.

4. Learned State counsel, however, contends that the case of the petitioner is different from that of co-accused in as much as the injury attracting Section 109 and 118(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 were not attributed to the said co-accused. He contends that a perusal of the allegations levelled in the FIR clearly show that the complainant specifically stated that petitioner-Ashwani Khairwal son of Pappu Khairwal and co-accused/Kallu son of Kanwarpal gave *datar* and chain *grari* blows upon Manraj son of Dhanna Singh, which hit on his head and arm. The said

injuries were grievous and were opined dangerous to life. It is submitted that the recovery of the weapon is yet to be effected and there is no special circumstances in which the concession ought to be extended to the petitioner especially when the other party has no reason to falsely implicate him.

5. It is evident that the argument of the counsel for the petitioner that no role has been attributed to the petitioner herein is misconceived as there is a specific attribution to him and that too on the vital part of the body i.e. head with a datar which such injury has been opined dangerous to life. It is further well established from the perusal of the MLRs that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused, while being armed with deadly weapons, attacked the complainant while he was lying on the floor. There were multiple fractures on the various parts of the body of the complainant as well as on the other injured witnesses.

6. Consequently, I do not find any compelling and convincing circumstances in the present case as may entitle the petitioner for an indulgence of an anticipatory bail. Lacking any merit, the present petition is dismissed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

24.04.2026

Mangal Singh

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