



CRM-M-59918-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

205

CRM-M-59918-2025

Date of decision : 30.01.2026

ANMOL DHIMAN

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Samdish Sahdev, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Divyanshu Juneja, Advocate (Through V.C.) for
Mr. Saurav Khurana, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. This is a petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS'), for anticipatory bail in a case arising out of DDR No.025 dated 30.08.2025, under Sections 118(1), 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, [pertaining to FIR No.86 dated 30.08.2025 under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 74 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023], Police Station Naya Gaon, District SAS Nagar.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that a DDR related to a case wherein the FIR had been lodged, came into being on the



statement of Anu Dhiman, who stated that the petitioner, whose marriage was solemnized with her, was having a matrimonial dispute with his wife, and to settle the abovementioned dispute, a meeting had taken place at the residence of petitioner, where, due to differences, a quarrel took place between the parties, and as a result thereof, at the instance of Anmol Dhiman (petitioner herein), the FIR was registered. Thereafter, when Anu Dhiman, the wife of the petitioner approached the police and complained that in the abovementioned incident she had suffered injuries, the instant DDR was lodged.

3. Heard.

4. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the benefit of interim anticipatory bail was afforded to the petitioner, and that in compliance with the above-mentioned order dated 17.11.2025, the petitioner has already joined investigation. It has been further contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate, and that the dispute between the petitioner and the complainant is a matrimonial dispute. As per learned counsel for the petitioner nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner and therefore, the order dated 17.11.2025 be made absolute.

5. The learned State Counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel although the petitioner has joined investigation but his attitude has been non-cooperative, and that the weapon of offence is yet to be recovered with the assistance of petitioner. It has also



been contended by learned State counsel that allegations against the petitioner are for the commission of serious nature of offence, and therefore, he is not entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. In response to above-mentioned arguments, the learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the alleged weapon of offence is only a wooden stick, which was recovered by the Investigating Officer on the day of incident itself.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of the record shows that there are several factors which are required to be taken into consideration at this stage. Those factors are:-

- i. that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii. that the maximum punishment prescribed for the offence is imprisonment up to 07 years;
- iii. that the dispute between the petitioner and the complainant is an off spring of martial discord between the petitioner and the complainant;
- iv. that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- v. that trial of the case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi. that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents;
- vii. that there is nothing on record to show that if the order dated 17.11.2025 is made absolute, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and



viii. that there is nothing on record to show that if order dated 17.11.2025 is made absolute, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation/trial.

9. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, the order dated 17.11.2025, granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is hereby made absolute. The present petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

30.01.2026
vipin

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No