



107

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

**CRM-M-33878-2026
DECIDED ON: 02.07.2026**

KULDEEP SINGH**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

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

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present 2nd petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.164, dated 09.08.2025, under Sections 109, 121, 132, 221, 307, 111, 61(2) of BNS (corresponding to sections 307, 353, 186, 382, 120-B of IPC), registered at Police Station Khanna, District Ludhiana.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, complainant (a police official), noticed three persons attempting to unbolt the tyre of a parked truck. Upon confronting them, complainant was allegedly attacked and sustained injuries.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that alleged occurrence took place at about 12:30 A.M. on 08.08.2025, whereas FIR came to be registered only on 09.08.2025.

It is further contended that, in the FIR, complainant initially stated that he was unaware of the identity of the assailants. However, it is

subsequently alleged that he came to know that one of the accused was Parminder Singh (owner of the canter), and the other was Kuldeep Singh (driver of the canter), who is the petitioner herein.

4. Learned counsel further submits that, even as per the prosecution case, petitioner was neither seen driving the canter nor he was apprehended on the spot. Merely describing the petitioner as driver of the canter, without disclosing the basis on which his identity or occupation came to be ascertained, does not connect him with the alleged occurrence. It is argued that prosecution has failed to explain how the petitioner came to be identified as the driver of the canter, rendering his implication wholly baseless. It is, therefore, contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Thus, counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed status report dated 23.06.2026 and in the Court today, and the same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place.

6. While referring to the status report, learned State counsel submits that a specific and active role has been attributed to the petitioner in the present case. It is contended that petitioner grappled with the complainant, who is a police official, and caused him injuries.

7. By producing photocopy of the MLR, learned State counsel further submits that complainant sustained total seven injuries in the alleged occurrence. However, it is fairly conceded that none of the injuries has, as yet, been declared grievous or dangerous to life. It is

nevertheless submitted that final opinion of the doctor regarding nature of the injuries is still awaited.

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

9. Contention raised by learned State counsel that doctor's opinion regarding nature of the injuries is still awaited does not merit much weight, at this stage. Alleged occurrence took place on 08.08.2025, nearly ten months ago, and despite lapse of considerable time, investigating agency has not been able to obtain the final medical opinion. Furthermore, status report is silent as in what manner complainant, who initially claimed to be unaware of the identity of assailants, subsequently came to know the petitioner's name and that he was allegedly driver of the canter.

Needless to observe, all such aspects, including identification of the accused, basis of their implication, and mentioning of their names in the FIR, are matters to be examined during the course of trial on the basis of the evidence led by the parties.

10. In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not find any compelling reason necessitating the custodial interrogation of the petitioner, and, accordingly, deems it appropriate to dispose of the same, with the direction to the petitioner to join the investigation 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.).

11. 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.

12. However, it is clarified that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigation, present bail order shall be deemed inoperative, and investigating officer shall proceed immediately to arrest the petitioner, in accordance with law.

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

02.07.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>