



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209-3

CRM-M No.62838 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision :27.01.2026

Bhupinder Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Ms.R.S.Bains, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Utsav Bains, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. This is a petition for anticipatory bail filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in a case arising out of FIR No.143 dated 23.07.2025, under Sections 121(1), 221, 132, 109, 190 of BNS, Police Station Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur.

2. Vide order dated 11.11.2025, the petitioners were admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer.

3. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that in compliance of above mentioned order, the petitioners have already joined investigation and that the order dated 11.11.2025, whereby the petitioners were afforded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, be made absolute.



4. It has been contended by learned State counsel that as per instructions received by him from the Investigating Officer, although the petitioners have joined investigation but the weapon of offence is yet to be recovered.

5. Heard. The record has been perused carefully.

6. A perusal of the record shows that allegations contained in the FIR nowhere shows that any weapon was used by the petitioners, or by any other assailants at the time of commission of offence. Thus, in my opinion the above mentioned plea does not hold good.

7. In view of facts and circumstances of present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for the purpose of decision in the present petition:-

- i) that nothing has been recovered from the possession of petitioners;
- ii) that the investigation and trial of the case are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- iii) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioners;
- iv) that benefit of bail has already been accorded to co-accused;
- v) that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioners are likely to tamper with the evidence or



influence the witnesses; and

- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioners will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

8. In view of above, it is hereby held that the present petition deserves to be allowed and the order dated 11.11.2025, whereby the benefit of interim bail was accorded to the petitioners, deserves to be made absolute.

9. Hence the present petition stands allowed and the order dated 11.11.2025 is hereby made absolute.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

27.01.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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