



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103-1

CRM-M-24544-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.05.2026

Ravinder Singh and another

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

103-2

CRM-M-24560-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.05.2026

Sakattar Singh and another

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Malkiat Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Both these petitions, filed by different accused/petitioners, for grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.33 dated 01.03.2026, registered under Section(s) 115(2), 117(2), 298, 324(4), 351(2), 191(3), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Kathunangal, District Amritsar, are being decided by this common order. For the facility of reference, the facts are, however, being taken from **CRM-M-24544-2026** titled as '*Ravinder Singh and another Vs. State of Punjab*'.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the allegations levelled against the petitioners, on 09.02.2026, the complainant was going to his shop on his scooter and petitioner-Sakattar Singh (in CRM-M-24560-2026) who was coming from the opposite side

103-1
103-2

CRM-M-24544-2026 (O&M)
CRM-M-24560-2026 (O&M)

tried to hit the complainant with his vehicle. It is further alleged that at about 1.45 P.M. on the same day petitioner-Sakattar Singh and Shamsheer Singh @ Shera alongwith the petitioners (in CRM-M-24544-2026) forcibly entered into the shop of the complainant and threatened and abused his workers. It is also alleged that later at about 2.10 P.M., co-accused alongwith the petitioners armed with weapons attacked the complainant and caused injuries.

3. It is evident that after occurrence of first incident, the petitioners returned & acting in concert surrounded the victim-Dilbag Singh and caused injuries to him. The manner in which the petitioners returned and threatened the workers and also inflicted injuries upon the victim/complainant indicates not a spontaneous act but a pre-meditated course of conduct showing intention to throw in a reign of terror in retaliation to the incident that took place earlier. The contention of the petitioners that the incident was a chance altercation could have been well accepted had the events formed part of a single altercation and had taken place at the same time. However, the said event having taken place after some time of the earlier incident on the same day and that too when the victim was alone and the petitioner party had gathered additional persons so as to inflict injuries, reflects a prior deliberation and common intention to cause injuries which are prima facie opined to be grievous in nature.

4. Counsel for the petitioners further contends that petitioner-Sakattar Singh (in CRM-M-24560-2026) had also sustained injuries in the incident. However, I am of the opinion that under the circumstances of the present case, when the petitioner himself is the aggressor, he cannot capitalize on the injuries sustained by him in the attack which was

103-1
103-2

CRM-M-24544-2026 (O&M)
CRM-M-24560-2026 (O&M)

orchestrated by him upon the victim. Merely the fact that he has also sustained injuries whether in return or in an attempt by the complainant to protect himself in exercise of rights of private defence, the same cannot give rise to any indulgence or presumption in favour of the petitioner herein to be the victim of the assault. He further submits that there is a delay of 21 days in registration of the FIR, however, it is his own case that the parties are residents of the same village, hence, the fact that the parties might be trying to negotiate and amicably settle the dispute cannot be ruled out at this juncture. While considering an application for grant of anticipatory bail, the High Court is required to take into consideration the nature and manner in which the offence has been committed and once the conscious participation of the parties is well reflected from the material on record, in such circumstances, such a party may not ordinarily be entitled to concession of anticipatory bail which is purely a discretionary remedy. The grant of anticipatory bail being an extraordinary remedy, the same is to be exercised judiciously upon a careful evaluation of the prima facie case and the balance of convenience. In the present case, counsel for the petitioners has failed to establish a case warranting exercise of such discretion in favour of the petitioners.

5. In view of the above, no grounds for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners are made out. Consequently, both the petitions are ***dismissed***.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

01.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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