



**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh**

**Criminal Misc. No. M-29829 of 2026**

**Date of Decision: 03.07.2026**

Bikram Singh and Others

... 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 petitioners 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 22.05.2026, the petitioners were admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioners 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 petitioners that in compliance with order dated 22.05.2026, the petitioners have already joined the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioners. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioners have requested that the order dated 22.05.2026 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 petitioners have joined the investigation, but they are 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 commission of above-mentioned offence is imprisonment up to five years;
- iii) that the petitioners have clean antecedents;
- iv) that the investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- v) that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioners;

- vi) that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- vii) that the detention of petitioners in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioners are likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- ix) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioners will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the petitioners have already joined the investigation, it is hereby ordered that the petitioners are entitled to anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is hereby **allowed** and the order dated 22.05.2026, whereby the petitioners were 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