



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-65060-2025

HARJEET SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

Date of decision: 19.01.2026

Date of uploading: 19.01.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Achin Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.166 dated 08.09.2025 registered at Police Station Sadar Kotkapur, District Faridkot, under Sections 110, 126(2), 115(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (later on added Section 109, 2023 of BNS and deleted Section 110 of BNS, 2023).

2. On 19.11.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.166 dated 08.09.2025 registered at Police Station Sadar Kotkapur, District Faridkot, under Sections 110, 126(2), 115(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (later on added Section 109, 2023 of BNS and deleted Section 110 of BNS, 2023).

Notice of motion. Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab, has appeared and accepted notice on behalf of the State. Both the parties have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Jagsir Singh @ Shira with the allegations that on 03.09.2025, at about 8:30 P.M., he was passing nearby the Temple of Baba Kesar Kumar and going towards his house, when Gippi resident of his village and Looniwal met him



who were known to him previously. They took him towards Semnala Sugar Mill, Faridkot, but he resisted. Meanwhile, Happy Studiowala son of Balvir Singh (petitioner) came there armed with rod and stick. Gippi took iron rod from Happy Studiowala and gave a blow on his head with the same. Thereafter, Happy inflicted injuries on both of his legs with stick and later on, all of them inflicted injuries upon his back and they kept on beating him after surrounding him and thereafter, they ran away from the spot. Subsequently, complainant got recorded a supplementary statement dated 11.09.2025 to the effect that earlier he forgot to inform the police that assailants had caused injuries to him with an intention to kill him and after the supplementary statement was recorded, the offence under Section 109 BNS was added.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated. The victim has not suffered any injury which could be dangerous to life sufficient to cause death and only simple injuries have been suffered by him. Offence under Section 109 BNS has been added subsequently on the basis of supplementary statement. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is ready to join the investigation. Nothing is to be recovered from the accused and he shall abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court.

On the other hand learned State Counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Adjourned to 19.01.2026 for filing status report.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;*
- iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section."*

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 19.11.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand; especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated therein and is no longer required by the State for further custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated



19.11.2025, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

- 5. Ordered accordingly.
- 6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
- 7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
- 8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
- 9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

19.01.2026
jatin

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