



101

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

**CRM-M-33217-2025
DECIDED ON: 15.05.2026**

**BALJEET SINGH ALIAS BALJEET CHAUDHARY
.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

**STATE OF PUNJAB
.....RESPONDENT**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Abhaysher Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Umaid Singh Mann, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.133, dated 11.05.2025, under Sections 125, 351(3), 324(4) of BNS (sections 109, 191(3), 190 of BNS added later on) and sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Phase 1, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 24.06.2025, following order was passed:-

“2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has not been named in the FIR. It is further submitted that the co-accused, namely Deepak Kumar, who is specifically named in the FIR, has already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 18.06.2025 passed in CRM-M-32739- 2025 (P-2). Counsel further submits that the dispute between the parties has since been amicably resolved, and as

such, subjecting the petitioner to custodial interrogation would serve no meaningful purpose and would be a futile exercise. Thus, prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. *Notice of motion.*

On advance notice, Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State.

4. *Mr. Rajeev Sharma, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, endorses the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and submits that the parties have in fact amicably resolved the dispute.*

5. *Adjourned to 18.09.2025*

6. *In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

7. *Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. On the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that parties, i.e. petitioner and complainant, have arrived at a compromise. In this regard, a petition, i.e. CRM-M-27526-2026, seeking quashing of FIR No.133 dated 11.05.2025 (supra), on the basis of compromise dated 09.05.2026, has already been filed, and is listed today before this Court.

4. Learned counsel further submits that, although allegations regarding firing of shots have been levelled against the accused persons, but it is not disputed by learned counsel for the complainant as well as learned State counsel that no person sustained any injury in the alleged

occurrence. Therefore, *prima facie*, provisions of Section 109 of BNS would not be attracted in the present case; in any event, the issue would remain debatable.

5. It is further submitted that this Court, vide order of even date passed in CRM-M-27526-2026, has directed the parties to appear before the Court concerned, for recording of their statements with regard to the compromise. On the strength of the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel, as well as learned counsel for the complainant, are unable to dispute the factual assertions advanced on behalf of the petitioner today before this Court.

7. However, learned State counsel submits that, apart from the present case, petitioner is also involved in several other criminal cases and, therefore, does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail in the present matter.

8. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

9. In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find it necessary to keep the present petition pending any further and, accordingly, deems it appropriate to dispose of the same, with the direction to the petitioner to join the investigation once again, within two weeks from today or as and when called by the investigating officer, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of

the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

10. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

11. With the directions recorded here above, present petition stands disposed of.

15.05.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No