



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

(109)

CRM-M-27925-2026

DATE OF DECISION: 18.05.2026

Balwinder Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Inderjit Singh Chawla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNSS'), the petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.0054 dated 03.04.2026 (Annexure P-1), under Section 329(3) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNS') and Section 3(1) of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984, registered at Police Station Sadar Jalalabad, District Fazilka.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that there has been an inordinate and unexplained delay in the registration of the FIR; that the present case arises out of village friction, as civil litigation regarding demarcation of land, is already pending between the Gram Panchayat and the petitioner; that the allegations pertain only to alleged damage to a demarcation pillar and do not involve any injury to any person; that the petitioner has clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal



CRM-M-27925-2026

2

case and that the case of the present petitioner is similar to that of co-accused Gulzar Singh and Lachman Singh, who have been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 06.05.2026 and 07.05.2026 passed in CRM-M-25479-2026 and CRM-M-25957-2026, respectively. Hence, prayer is made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner be granted the relief of anticipatory bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, appears on behalf of the respondent-State and opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that a lawful demarcation of the land was carried out by the competent authorities and demarcation pillars were duly erected at the spot. However, the petitioner, in connivance with co-accused illegally removed the said demarcation pillars, thereby caused damage to the public property and committed alleged offence. However, fairly admits the fact that case of the petitioner is similar to that of co-accused Gulzar Singh and Lachman Singh, who have been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 06.05.2026 and 07.05.2026 passed in CRM-M-25479-2026 and CRM-M-25957-2026, respectively.

5. Heard.

6. Taking into consideration the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court finds that the allegations pertain to removal of demarcation pillar in the backdrop of an admitted land dispute, which is already subject matter of pending civil litigation between the parties. There is also an unexplained



delay in lodging the FIR and it is a no injury case. The petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is willing to join the investigation. Moreover, the case of the petitioner is similar to that of co-accused Gulzar Singh and Lachman Singh, who have been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 06.05.2026 and 07.05.2026, passed in CRM-M-25479-2026 and CRM-M-25957-2026, respectively. Hence, this Court finds it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present petition is **disposed of** with a direction to the petitioner to join investigation as and when required by the investigating officer. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail on his furnishing personal bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of arresting/investigating officer and he shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

18.05.2026 (SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta JUDGE

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