



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209-2

CRM-M No.62430 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision :27.01.2026

Dilbagh Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

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

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 07.11.2025, the petitioner was 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 petitioner that in compliance of above mentioned order, the petitioner has already joined investigation and that the order dated 07.11.2025, whereby the petitioner was 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 petitioner has 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 petitioner, 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 to be recovered from possession of petitioners;
- ii) that trial of the case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- iii) that detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- iv) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- v) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence; and
- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail,



the petitioner 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 07.11.2025, whereby the benefit of interim bail was accorded to the petitioner, deserves to be made absolute.

9. Hence the present petition stands allowed and the order dated 07.11.2025 is hereby made absolute.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

27.01.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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