



102

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

**CRM-M-27517-2026
DECIDED ON: 15.05.2026**

TEHAL SINGH**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Pradeep Virk, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Ajay Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.67, dated 07.04.2026, under Sections 110, 115(2), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS (corresponding to sections 308, 323, 506, 34 of IPC), registered at Police Station Dehlon, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. Complainant, in the present case, lodged the FIR alleging that occurrence took place in the fields while repairing a water channel at about 11:20 A.M. on 06.04.2026. It is alleged that accused Gurveer Singh raised a *lalkara*, exhorting that son-in-law, who was attempting to assert dominance in the village, should be driven away. Thereupon, Tehal Singh (petitioner herein) allegedly picked up a hammer lying near the water channel and inflicted a blow upon Ranjit Singh (complainant's father-in-law), which landed on the left side of his head.

It is further alleged that accused Gurveer Singh struck the complainant with a stick on the back side of his head. Thereafter, accused Jasmandeep Singh allegedly inflicted a stick blow on the complainant's arm. Again, Gurveer Singh allegedly struck the complainant with a stick, which hit his right hand. Subsequently, petitioner-Tehal Singh allegedly

delivered another hammer blow to the complainant's father-in-law near his left ear, causing him to fall to the ground. When the complainant stepped forward to rescue his father-in-law, petitioner allegedly struck him near his left eye, as a result of which he too fell to the ground.

It is further alleged that, while both the injured persons were lying on the ground, the accused persons continued to assault them with sticks on their legs and other parts of the body.

3. As per the medico-legal reports (MLRs) of injured Ranjit Singh and complainant Surinder Singh, they sustained total 12 injuries, i.e. 5 and 7 injuries, respectively. Further, CT scan report of injured Ranjit Singh reveals an associated fracture of the left parietal and temporal bones, along with foci of intracranial air adjacent to the fracture site.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner himself had sustained injuries and injuries caused to the complainant party were inflicted in exercise of the right of private defence.

5. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available before it.

6. *Prima facie*, plea raised on behalf of the petitioner does not appear to be convincing. Till date, no formal complaint has been lodged by the petitioner, except for a representation dated 08.04.2026 addressed to the Police Commissioner, Ludhiana. Even the medical record of Dayanand Medical College and Hospital, Ludhiana, does not reflect any specific injury having been sustained by the petitioner.

7. In view of the nature and gravity of the allegations, injuries suffered by the victims, and the material available on record, this Court does not find any ground to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. **Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.**

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

15.05.2026
Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>