

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH****104+206****Criminal Miscellaneous No.M-31007 of 2025 (O&M)****Date of Decision: 28th January 2026**Navneet Aggarwal

..... PETITIONER(S)

*VERSUS*State of Punjab

..... RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**PRESENT:** - Mr. Sanjay Kaushal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. A.P. Setia and Mr. Arjun Kaushal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Singh, D.A.G., Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J**CRM- 38242-2025 in CRM-M-31007-2025**

Present application has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS
for placing on record additional affidavit of the petitioner, along with Annexures
P-21 to P-28, so that matter may finally be argued and decided.

Same is allowed.

CRM-M-31007-2025

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of BNSS praying for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the case bearing FIR No. 76 dated 07.05.2025 registered under Sections 331(6), 118(2), 115(2), 61(2), 191(3) and 190 of BNS, Police Station Dakha, District Ludhiana Rural.
2. Brief facts of the case are that complainant Ravi Kumar is a contractor by profession, and on the date of the incident, i.e. on 04.05.2025 at



about 9:00 PM, he was present alongwith his labour and machinery at the plot of Pranav Chadha. Co-accused Lakhvir Singh alias Lakha and Gurdarshan Singh, and some unknown persons came to the said plot in a white swift car, carrying sharp weapons, pushed the gate and entered the plot. Gurdarshan Singh raised a *lalkara*, and said that the plot belonged to their boss Navneet Aggarwal (present petitioner), and upon saying this, he gave a sword blow to the complainant on his left arm, and Lakhvir Singh @ Lakha and other unknown person started beating the labourers. Thereafter, the aggressors fled away the site while extending threats. The complainant specifically alleged in the F.I.R. that the said attack had been carried out at the behest of Navneet Singh i.e. the present petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and the contents of the F.I.R. are concocted. The true facts of the case are that the present petitioner and one Pranav Chadha have a property dispute concerning the property on which the alleged offence was committed, stemming from a loan taken by the petitioner during the period of Corona, having suffered immense loss in his business; the said loan was availed from one Jasbir Singh, and it is during obtaining this loan that he also came in touch with Pranav Chadha. The complainant in the present case is a 'yes-man' of Pranav Chadha. To avail the loan, the petitioner was asked to execute said deed of a property as security for the amount taken as loan; the said sale deed was executed by the daughter of the petitioner in favour of Pranav Chadha on asking of Jasbir Singh. After the due payments were made, when the petitioner asked Jasbir Singh to re-execute sale deeds in their favour as agreed between them. Jasbir Singh refused. In the said sale deed, land measuring 2616.62 sq. yards was transferred out of a total chunk of 11,000 square yards. Even if the said sale deed is assumed to be correct, still, the said sale deed does



not speak of transfer of any passage by any of the petitioner, which is the relevant disputed property in the present case. The said Pranav Chadha has got lodged F.I.R. No. 59 dated 17.04.2025 under Sections 305(A), 329(3), 318(4), 317(3), 296, 62, 190, 191(2) and 6 at Police Station Dakha, District Ludhiana; that the said Pranav Chadha also got another F.I.R. lodged against the present petitioner through his wife i.e. F.I.R. No. 46 dated 02.05.2025 under Sections 78,79 and 351 of B.N.S. along with Sections 66(C) and 66(E) at Police Station Dakha, District Ludhiana. Hence, due to the said dispute over property, the present petitioner is being implicated in one litigation after another either by Pranav Chadha himself, and through other persons at his behest. In the above-stated FIR No. 59 dated 17.04.2025, lodged by the complainant, petitioner's daughter Sabhya Aggarwal was granted concession of anticipatory bail by Ld. Trial Court **(Annexure P-2)**, and present petitioner and his brother was granted concession of anticipatory bail by a co-ordinate bench of this Hon'ble Court **(Annexures P-3 and P-4)**. Additionally, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that co-accused Lakhvir Singh @ Lakha and Gurdashan Singh have entered into compromise with the complainant Ravi Kumar, vide compromise dated 11.08.2025 **(Annexure P-22)**, and sought to place reliance on the same. Hence, the learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for the concession of bail to the present petitioner, as he is ready and willing to join investigation.

4. Learned State Counsel, assisted by counsel for the complainant, vehemently opposed the present petition seeking anticipatory bail to the present petitioner. It was submitted that the present petitioner has been actively involved in the commission of offence in the present FIR. Present petitioner is the main accused, as the aggressors acted at the behest of the present petitioner, trespassed onto the construction site where the complainant was employed to carry out the



construction activities. The complainant, who was employed as a contractor and the labourers assisting him were unreasonably attacked by the goons acting on behalf of the present petitioner, without any reasonable attribution to them, only to instill fear and illegally assert dominance over the said land. Present petitioner has been specifically named in the F.I.R., and a specific role of being the main conspirator behind the incident in question is attributed to the present petitioner. Learned State Counsel drew attention of the Court to the Status Report filed by the State, wherein during investigation, it has surfaced that the present petitioner promised to give ₹5,00,000/- (five lakh) to the co-accused for carrying out the said offence, and rupees one lakh had been paid in advance for the same; further, Call Detail Records have surfaced between the present petitioner and the co-accused Lakhvir Singh @ Lakha, and there were as many as thirteen calls between them, and there were four calls between co-accused Lakhvir Singh @ Lakha and Gurdarshan Singh before the incident, which prima facie reflects prior meeting of minds, and involvement of present petitioner in the commission of offence. Learned State Counsel lastly contended that there is a serious apprehension that if released on bail, the petitioner will indulge in similar unlawful activities, or may tamper with the prosecution evidence, or influence or threaten the witnesses, hence, prayed for dismissal of the present petition seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard, and paper book perused.

6. As per the facts and circumstances of the case and contentions of the learned counsel for the parties, the petitioner has been specifically named in the F.I.R.; co-accused are alleged to be goons who were hired by the present petitioner; allegedly, in pursuance of conspiracy hatched by the petitioner, and at behest of the petitioner, the goons illegally trespassed over the said property



where the complainant was employed as contractor, and later gave beatings to the contractor as well as the innocent labourers employed at the site, who were present at the place of occurrence only to earn their livelihood, and were assaulted for no fault of theirs, only to create an atmosphere of fear, terror and alarm; the petitioner does not have clean antecedents, and is involved in two more FIRs; perusal of the Status Report filed by the respondent-State suggests active involvement of the present petitioner in the commission of the offence, as allegedly, he agreed to pay rupees five lakh to the co-accused to carry out the present crime, and paid rupees one lakh rupees upfront for the same; as per contention of the Learned State Counsel, there is a serious apprehension that if released on bail, petitioner would hamper the investigation, or influence or threaten prosecution witnesses; as far as contention of the learned counsel for petitioner that a compromise has been effected is concerned, the same does not aid the petitioner's case in any manner, as it has specifically been mentioned that the said compromise is only effected with both co-accused, Lakhvir Singh @ Lakha and Gurdarshan Singh, and not qua another accused, and more importantly, because the offences under Sections 331(6), 118(2), 61(2), 191(3) and 190 of BNS mentioned in the FIR, are non-compoundable in nature. Hence, in view of the afore-stated discussion, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the contentions raised by the Learned Counsel for the petitioner lack force.

7. Anticipatory bail is an extraordinary relief, to be granted sparingly, only in exceptional cases deserving of the concession. The grant of such relief becomes even more circumscribed in cases involving serious offences as those alleged in the present case, especially where there is a grave apprehension or propensity of the applicant/petitioner to interfere with the course of law and



prosecution of the case, either by committing similar offences, or threatening or influencing the witnesses. One of the cardinal principles in the administration of justice is, *'justice should not only be done, but also seem to be done'*; accordingly, release of the petitioner in the present case is not warranted considering the peculiar facts of the case. Recently, Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Srikant Upadhyay v. State of Bihar, 2024 INSC 202***, has made the following observation with regard to concession of Anticipatory Bail:-

"We have already held that the power to grant anticipatory bail is an extraordinary power. Though in many cases it was held that bail is said to be a rule, it cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be said that anticipatory bail is the rule..... While called upon to exercise the said power, the Court concerned has to be very cautious as the grant of interim protection or protection to the accused in serious cases may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper the investigation to a great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or distraction of the evidence."

8. Moreover, as the investigation is still on-going, custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is necessary for effecting a proper and in-depth investigation in the case. Hon'ble Apex Court in ***State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187***, emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by anticipatory bail, wherein interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.



CRM-M-31007 of 2025

[7]

9. In view of the aforesaid discussion, this Court finds no merit in the present petition, and it is hereby **dismissed**.
10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.
11. Pending application(s), if any, also stand **disposed** of.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

January 28, 2026
avin

<u>Whether Speaking/ Reasoned:</u>	<u>Yes/ No</u>
<u>Whether Reportable:</u>	<u>Yes/ No</u>