



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

117

Date of decision: 16.03.2026

CRM-M-26507-2025

DIPUPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHERRespondents

CRM-M-26570-2025

DIPUPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHERRespondents

CRM-M-26578-2025

DIPUPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHERRespondents

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

Present: - Mr. Aarjav Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Liaquat Ali, Advocate for respondent No.2.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. These three petitions seeking cancellation of bail of three different accused persons vide separate orders passed granting bail by the trial Court in case FIR No. 110 dated 17.06.2020 registered under Sections(s) 307/341/506/148/149 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Jodhewal, District Ludhiana are being decided by a common order.
2. A brief reference to the facts is, however, made from CRM-M-26507-2025 titled '*Dipu versus State of Punjab and another*'.
3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner raised the following arguments at the time when notice of motion was issued on 15.09.2025:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that respondent No.2-accused/Sonu in CRM-M-26507-2025; respondent No.2-accused/ Nusrat in CRM-M-26570-2025; and respondent No.2-accused/Irfan in CRM-M-26578-2025; are accused in FIR bearing No. 110 dated 17.06.2020 under Sections 307, 341, 506, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Jodhewal, District Ludhiana. All the accused have been granted regular bail by this Court in the respective case vide orders dated 11.04.2023; 07.01.2021; and 11.02.2021 respectively. He contends that notwithstanding the conditions of bail that the accused shall not threaten any witness/tamper with any evidence, yet, the said terms & conditions of Section 437(3) of Cr.P.C. have been violated by the accused persons as they not only threatened the prosecution witnesses but also gave beatings to the petitioner. He contends that on 25.10.2024, the accused persons found the petitioner alone near Gandhi Nagar at about 12.00 p.m. The accused Nusrat raised a lalkara to teach a lesson to the petitioner and on such lalkara, the other accused inflicted multiple injuries on

the head of the petitioner with bricks. He was saved by the passerby persons namely, Dhana, Raju etc. He was taken to the Civil Hospital, Ludhiana, where he was medico-legally examined. He contends that the respondent(s)-accused persons had attempted to contact the petitioner multiple times to pressurize him to resile from his statement and to not support the case of the prosecution, failing which, he shall be eliminated. He contends that notwithstanding the assault on the petitioner and repeated attempts by the respondent(s)-accused persons to pressurize the petitioner to resile from his testimony, no steps have been taken.

Separate affidavits on behalf of respondent(s)-State in all three petitions have been filed by the learned State counsel today in the Court and the same are taken on record. But no reply has been filed on behalf of the private respondent(s)-accused.

Counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that even though the respondent-State has stated in its reply that intimations to join inquiry were sent on 28.06.2025, 03.07.2025 and 30.07.2025, however, the description of the phone on which such a message had been sent is not mentioned whereas the specific phone number of the petitioner as per the petition is 97812-27307. He contends that he has instructions that no information was received by the petitioner about the inquiry and that he had never avoided joining the inquiry. He further contends that the petitioner has also not been examined so far.

Let an affidavit be filed by the petitioner in support of contention that the notices sent by the Police calling upon the petitioner to join the inquiry had not been received by him.

List on 29.09.2025.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

4. On resumed hearing, Counsel for the respondent-State contends that the purported complaint submitted by the petitioner was looked into by the Police and that despite the official(s) summoning the petitioner on a number of occasions to join investigation to submit his evidence, he has chosen not to come forth to substantiate his allegations in the complaint/representation submitted to the respondent-authorities.

5. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent No.2 in all the petitions contends that the petitioner has attempted to mislead this Court by appending photographs that had resulted in registration of FIR and to portray as if the said injuries were caused in a subsequent incident that took place on 24.10.2024. It is submitted that the medico legal report of the alleged incident of 24.10.2024 thus, in no manner, suggests any of the injuries having been caused in any other incident. He thus contends that the petitioner made a mischievous attempt by referring to the documents which were already part of the record, at the time of grant of bail to the accused and by making an assertion that the said injuries had been caused subsequently and thus amounted to misuse of the concession of bail granted.

6. Counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to dispute that the photographs appended alongwith the present petition do not corroborate the medico legal report dated 24.10.2024 appended by the petitioner alongwith the present case. Besides, he is also not in a position to refer as to why the petitioner chose not to associate himself with the investigation despite being called on a number of occasions, in support of his allegations. While this court records displeasure at a mischievous attempt made by the petitioner to mislead this Court while making a representation to this Court about a subsequent incident that had taken place which resulted in grievous injury on

vital part, by referring to the evidence which was part of the original FIR as well as part of the challan that has been filed. This Court finds that the petitioner has not been able to make out any case of misuse of concession by the respondent(s) or corroborate his allegation that the prosecution witness had been threatened by the accused. Consequently, the present petitions are found lacking in merit and the same are accordingly dismissed at this stage.

MARCH 16, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No