

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

CRM-M-62681-2025
Decided on: 23.03.2026

.....Petitioner

Versus

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Prince Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG Punjab

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.194, dated 24.08.2025, under Sections 126(2)/115(2)/118(1)/351(1)/351(3)/191(3)/190 of BNS, 2023 (Section 341/323/324/503/506/148/149 of IPC), registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

“(i) *** *** *** ***

(ii) Complainant, Anita, lodged an FIR stating that while she was returning home along with her husband, Mukander Singh, on a motorcycle at about 9:00 a.m., they were intercepted by a group of accused persons, who were identified as:- (1) Rohit, armed with a daatar/sickle; (2) Bobby, armed with a daatar/sickle; (3) Ajay, armed with a sword; (4) Rinka, armed with a daatar/sickle; (5) Harpreet Singh @ Happy, armed with a daatar/sickle; (6) Sunny, armed with a daatar/sickle; (7) Bobby, son of Dhira, armed with a baseball bat; (8) Neelam, empty-handed; (9) Parveen, empty-handed; (10) Guri.



armed with a bat; (11) Kali, armed with a sword; and (12) Kiran, empty-handed.

It is alleged that accused Neelam, Parveen, and Kiran raised a lalkara exhorting the others by saying, “Catch them and do not allow them to go today.” Acting upon this, accused persons began assaulting Mukander Singh, husband of the complainant, with their respective weapons. The specific details of the injuries and the assault are as follows:-

1.	<i>Rohit son of Tony</i>	<i>Direct blow of sickle on the head.</i>
2.	<i>Bobby son of Tony</i>	<i>Direct blow of sickle on the head.</i>
3.	<i>Ajay</i>	<i>Sword blow on nose.</i>
4.	<i>Rinku</i>	<i>Sickle blow on right arm.</i>
5.	<i>Harpreet Singh @ Happy</i>	<i>Sickle blow on left arm.</i>
6.	<i>Bobby son of Dhira</i>	<i>Hit on the waist, four times, with Baseball Bat</i>
7.	<i>Guri</i>	<i>Hit on head, 2/3 times, with Bat</i>
8.	<i>Kali</i>	<i>Two Sword blows, on the face</i>

Upon assault, Mukander Singh fell to the ground, became unconscious, and started bleeding profusely. On learning about the incident, Jinder Kaur (sister-in-law of complainant Anita) and Gurmeet Kaur reached the spot and attempted to rescue him. At that moment, another co-accused, Vishal, struck Gurmeet Kaur on her head with an iron rod, causing her serious injury. Seeing people gathering at the scene, all the accused fled from the spot along with their respective weapons, while issuing threats to kill the complainant and injured persons. Thereafter, complainant Anita, along with her sister-in-law Jinder Kaur, placed the injured Mukander Singh and Gurmeet Kaur in a car and took them to the Civil Hospital, Tarn Taran, where they were admitted in injured condition. Owing to the severity of their injuries, the attending doctor referred both the injured persons to Guru Nanak Dev Hospital, Amritsar, for further treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, as per the allegations, petitioner Rohit Kumar (in CRM-M-62592-2025) is accused of having inflicted a direct blow with a sickle on the head of the victim. Petitioner Kiran Kaur @ Kiran (in CRM-M-62681-2025) is alleged to have raised a lalkara by exhorting others to “catch and do not allow them to go today.” Petitioner Vishal (in CRM-M-62638-2025) is alleged to have inflicted a rod blow on the head of Gurmeet Kaur.

Learned counsel further submits that, in connection with the same incident, a cross-case has also been registered against the complainant party, vide GD No.30 dated 26.08.2025, under Sections 333/115(2)/324(4)

**CRM-M-62681-2025**

(5)/191(3)/190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station City, Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran (Annexure P-3). Therefore, it remains to be determined by the trial Court as to which party was the aggressor in the occurrence. Lastly, it is submitted that one of the co-accused Praveen @ Parveen, who was empty handed and allegedly gave Lalkara, has already been granted the concession of interim-anticipatory bail, vide order dated 30.10.2025, passed in CRM-M-60257-2025 (Annexure P-5), and said petition is listed for its hearing for 20.01.2026. Thus, prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the present cases.

(iv) Notice of motion.

(v) On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter

(vi) Since, neither learned counsel for the petitioners nor learned State counsel is presently acquainted with the nature of injuries sustained in the incident, list these cases again on 02.12.2025, for further consideration.

(vii) Learned State counsel is hereby directed to file a detailed status report in the matter, after verifying the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners today before this Court. The report shall also include particulars regarding the nature of injuries suffered by the victims in both the main case and the cross-version case.

(viii) A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.”

3. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer of bail, however, he could not point out any specific evidence or material collected during the investigation.

4. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it, and finds it appropriate to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject



CRM-M-62681-2025

to her 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.).

6. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over her passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if she possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that she 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.

7. With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

23.03.2026
reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:	YES/ NO
Whether Reportable:	YES /NO