

114 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33507-2026(O&M)
DECIDED ON: 10.06.2026

GURPREETPAL SINGH AND ANR

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Rajesh Duhan, Advocate for the petitioner(s)

Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. **Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 B.N.S.S. (438 of Cr.P.C.) for grant of Anticipatory bail pending trial to the Petitioners in case FIR No.50, dated 28.05.2026, U/s 333, 324, 115 (2), 351 (2), 351 (3) and 3 (5) BNS, 2023 (corresponding to section 452, 425, 323, 506 and 34 of IPC) registered at police station Ghanaur, District Patiala (Annexure P-1).

2. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the allegations regarding

criminal trespass, demolition of the boundary wall and damage to household articles are false. It is further contended that a civil dispute concerning the property in question has been pending between the parties since the year 2023 and a civil suit titled "*Daler Singh Vs. Gulab Singh and another*" is pending adjudication before the competent Civil Court. Learned counsel argues that the present FIR is an outcome of the said civil dispute and has been lodged with an ulterior motive to exert pressure upon the petitioners.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Satnam Preet Singh Chauhan, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State.

He opposes the petition for bail stating that specific allegations have been levelled against the petitioners in the FIR. It is contended that petitioners demolished the boundary wall of the complainant's house with the help of a tractor and caused damage to the complainant's household articles. He, therefore, prays for dismissal of the petition.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given due consideration to the submissions advanced, particularly to the fact the dispute between the parties admittedly pertains to immovable property and it is not disputed that a civil suit concerning the same property is already pending before the competent Civil Court. The allegations levelled against the petitioners are to be tested during the course of investigation and trial.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioners, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and are ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for

furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioners are directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to their joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

10.06.2026
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:Yes/No
:Yes/No