



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

104

CRM-M-59914-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.03.2026

Gurmej Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

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

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

Mr. B.S. Randhawa, Advocate for the complainant

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0125 dated 07.09.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 190, 191(3) of BNS (118(2) BNS added later on), at Police Station Sekhwan, District Batala.

2. On 04.11.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“1. As per the facts emanating from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the statement of Ranjit Singh, who stated that on 31.08.2025, when he was proceeding towards his village at about 04:30 P.M., Kewal Singh, Navdeep Singh, Gurmej Singh (petitioner) and Pritam Singh along with 2/3 unknown persons arrived there and that they were armed with sharp edged weapons and sticks etc. The complainant further alleged that Kewal Singh exhorted to teach a lesson to the complainant, and thereafter, they all launched attack upon him, causing multiple injuries. According to complainant, when he screamed for help, his son Davinder Singh and nephew Karanjit Singh arrived at the spot, but they, too, came under attack and suffered injuries. In the complaint, it has been specifically mentioned by the complainant that assailants, namely Pritam Singh and Kewal Singh were armed with sticks and they had inflicted injury on the right arm of his nephew-Karanjit Singh.

2. Notice of motion.

3. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent, and waives service.

4. Mr. Bikramjit Singh Randhawa, Advocate puts in appearance on behalf of complainant and files Vakalatnama, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that the benefit of bail has already been afforded to co-accused namely, Pritam Singh and Kewal Singh. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, in fact, the instant case is a case wherein it is the allegation of the petitioner that the complainant and his associates were aggressors and that they had launched attack upon the petitioner and his family members, wherein injuries were also suffered by the petitioner. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, the second fact to be taken into consideration is that the injuries suffered by the petitioner were examined by the medical officer and that the medico-legal examination of the petitioner was conducted before the complainant.

7. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate and that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of the petitioner, and that investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future.

8. Per contra, the learned State counsel has argued that the weapons of offence are to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, and that for that purpose custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

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

i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;

ii) that the investigation and trial of the case are not likely to be concluded in near future;

iii) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to serve any purpose;

iv) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence;

v) that benefit of anticipatory bail has already been afforded to the co-accused; and

vi) that there is nothing on record to show that if benefit of anticipatory bail is accorded to the petitioner, he will misuse the same by not participating in investigation/trial.

11. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of

all the above mentioned factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for interim anticipatory bail.

12. Thus, it is hereby ordered that in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

13. List on 10.12.2025.

14. Let status report and detailed reply be filed by the State by next date. ”

3. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the afore-mentioned order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, he shall make himself available without demur.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 04.11.2025 granting interim bail to him, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) BNSS.

6. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to him.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

20.03.2026
M.Kamra

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No