



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-28943 of 2026

Date of Decision: 03.07.2026

Satpal

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Munish Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Mr. Harminder Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for anticipatory bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 21 dated 26.04.2026, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 21(1) of 'the Mines and Minerals (Regulation of Development) Act, 1957', Police Station Nangal Bhoor, District Pathankot, Punjab.

2. Vide order dated 20.05.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

3. The learned State Counsel has filed status report. The same be

taken on record.

4. Heard.

5. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 20.05.2026, the petitioner has already joined the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 20.05.2026 be made absolute.

6. The learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, on the instructions of 'ASI Parkash Chand', has contended that although the petitioner has joined the investigation, but he is not entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail as the mining is still going and there is a threat to the existence of house built by the complainant.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. With regard to fact-situation of this case and the above mentioned arguments, following are the relevant factors which are supposed to be taken into consideration:-

- i) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation;
- ii) that the maximum punishment prescribed for the offence is imprisonment up to five years;
- iii) that nothing has to be recovered from the possession of the petitioner;
- iv) that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- v) that the investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely

to produce a fruitful result;

vii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and

viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, it is hereby ordered that the petitioner is entitled to anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is hereby **allowed** and the order dated 20.05.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

July 03, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No