

2026:PHHC:087355



125

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

**CRM-M-33795-2026
DECIDED ON: 12.06.2026**

GURMEJ SINGH**.....PETITIONER(S)****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****.....RESPONDENT(S)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Rajiv Kumar Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**1. Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked for the 2nd time under Section 482 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS)/ U/s 438 of Cr.P.C. for granting Bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 0125 dated 07.09.2025 Under Section 115(2), 118(1), 190, 191 (3) of BNS/ U/s 323, 324, 149, 148 of IPC and offence u/s 118(2) of BNS/ U/s 326 of IPC added later on, and offence u/s 109 of BNS/ U/s 307 of IPC added later on Vide G.D. No. 22 dated 27-04-2026 Police Station Sekhwan, District Batala.

2 Contention**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that there is an unexplained delay of 7

days in lodging the FIR, as the occurrence took place on 31.08.2025, whereas the FIR was registered on 07.09.2025. He further argued that the injury attributed to the petitioner was declared simple in nature, whereas the injury declared dangerous to life has been attributed to co-accused Navdeep Singh. He asserts that co-accused Pritam Singh has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 03.06.2026 (Annexure P-5) passed in CRM-M-32796-2026.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Satjot Singh Chahal, AAG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State, whereas Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his memorandum of appearance, which is taken on record.

Learned State counsel does not controvert the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and, rather, candidly submits that the injury which has been declared dangerous to life is attributed to co-accused Navdeep Singh.

3. **Analysis**

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, particularly the unexplained delay of 7 days in lodging the FIR, the nature of injury attributed to the petitioner being simple, the fact that the injury declared dangerous to life has been attributed to co-accused Navdeep Singh added with the fact that co-accused Pritam Singh has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 03.06.2026 (Annexure P-6), this Court is of the considered view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner does not appear to be warranted.

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 petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is 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 petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his 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.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

12.06.2026

Meenu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No