



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(201)

CRM-M-67026-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.4.2026

Ralinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Gaurav Vir Singh Behal, Advocate and
Mr. Jugraj Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yadwinder Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Himanshu Puri, Advocate for
Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 to 4.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482(2) of BNS, 2023, is for setting aside the orders dated 12.9.2025, 15.10.2025 and 27.10.2025 and further for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the private respondents vide orders dated 12.9.2025, 15.10.2025 and 27.10.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Malerkotla in case FIR No. 30 dated 17.5.2025, under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (Section 75 of BNS and Section 25 of the Arms Act, were added later on), registered at Police Station City Ahmedgarh, District Malerkotla.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Malerkotla vide orders dated 12.9.2025, 15.10.2025 and 27.10.2025 granted the concession of anticipatory bail to the private respondents. It is submitted that after securing the orders of



the petitioner and his family. Furthermore, there is a threat perception to the petitioner, and there is every likelihood that respondents No. 2 to 4 being influential persons might interfere with the investigation of the case, tamper with the evidence and further endanger the life and safety of the petitioner and his family. It is, therefore, submitted that the anticipatory bail granted to the private respondents deserves to be cancelled.

3. Per contra, learned counsel for respondents No. 2 to 4 opposes the present petition and submits that the learned trial Court after due consideration of the facts of the case and the evidence adduced granted the concession of anticipatory bail to the private respondents.

4. Learned State counsel while placing reliance on the status report dated 22.3.2026, submits that the petitioner filed a representation dated 11.1.2026 before the office of Senior Superintendent of Police, Malerkotla, alleging therein threats to his life and property at the hands of private respondents. During inquiry being conducted on the said representation by the Superintendent of Police (Investigation), Malerkotla, it transpired that both the parties had been repeatedly filing complaints against each other. Moreover, the petitioner failed to produce any independent or credible material in support of the allegations levelled in the abovesaid representation. Therefore, vide order dated 27.2.2026, the said representation was ordered to be filed. Furthermore, in order to maintain peace and order, preventive proceedings had already been initiated against both the sides vide DDR No. 22 dated 12.12.2025.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case record with their able assistance.

6. Perusal of the record reveals that it was only when pursuant to the orders dated 02.9.2025 and 30.9.2025, respondents Paramjit Kaur and



Amritpal Singh respectively had joined and cooperated in the investigation, thereafter vide impugned orders dated 12.9.2025 and 15.10.2025 respectively, they were granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the learned trial Court. Similarly, respondent-Baldev Singh was granted anticipatory bail vide impugned order dated 27.10.2025, upon his joining and cooperating in the investigation. Moreover, with regard to the alleged threat perception, no substantive evidence has been produced by the petitioner before the competent authority concerned. Mere apprehension that the private respondents will evade the process of law, without any cogent material to establish the same, does not suffice this Court to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondents No. 2 to 4.

7. As per the settled proposition of law, once bail has been granted, it would require cogent and overwhelming circumstances for its cancellation. The order granting bail can only be revoked by the Superior Court while granting the said concession ignored the relevant material available on record, as has been observed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Vipin Kumar Dhir Vs. State of Punjab, 2021 SCC Online SSC 854.***

8. In ***Ms. X vs The State of Telangana (2018) 16 SCC 511,*** Hon'ble Supreme Court held that:

*“In a consistent line of precedent this Court has emphasised the distinction between the rejection of bail in a non-bailable case at the initial stage and the cancellation of bail after it has been granted. In adverting to the distinction, a Bench of two learned Judges of this Court in *Dolatram v State of Haryana [(1995) 1 SCC 349]* observed that:*

“Rejection of a bail in a non-bailable case at the initial stage and the cancellation of bail so granted, have to be considered and dealt with on different basis. Very cogent and overwhelming circumstances are necessary for an order directing the cancellation of the bail, already granted. (Generally speaking, the grounds for cancellation of the bail, already granted, broadly (illustrative and not exhaustive) are: interference or attempt to interfere with the due course of administration of justice or evasion of attempt to evade the due course of justice or abuse of the concession granted to



the accused in any manner. The satisfaction of the court, on the basis of material placed on the record of the possibility of the accused absconding is yet another reason justifying the cancellation of bail. However, bail once granted should not be cancelled in a mechanical manner without considering whether any supervening circumstances have rendered it no longer conducive to a fair trial to allow the accused to retain his freedom by enjoying the concession of bail during the trial.”

*These principles have been reiterated by another two Judge Bench decision in Central Bureau of Investigation, **Hyderabad v Subramani Gopalakrishnan (2011) 5 SCC 296** and more recently in **Dataram Singh v State of Uttar Pradesh (2018) 3 SCC 22**:*

“It is also relevant to note that there is difference between yardsticks for cancellation of bail and appeal against the order granting bail. Very cogent and overwhelming circumstances are necessary for an order directing the cancellation of bail already granted. Generally speaking, the grounds for cancellation of bail are, interference or attempt to interfere with the due course of administration of justice or evasion or attempt to evade the due course of justice or abuse of the concessions granted to the accused in any manner. These are all only few illustrative materials. The satisfaction of the Court on the basis of the materials placed on record of the possibility of the accused absconding is another reason justifying the cancellation of bail. In other words, bail once granted should not be cancelled in a mechanical manner without considering whether any supervening circumstances have rendered it no longer conducive to a fair trial to allow the accused to retain his freedom by enjoying the concession of bail during the trial.”

9. A three Judge Bench of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Deepak Yadav Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another, (2022) 8 SCC 559**, speaking through Justice Krishna Murari, observed as follows:

“33. It is no doubt true that cancellation of bail cannot be limited to the occurrence of supervening circumstances. This Court certainly has the inherent powers and discretion to cancel the bail of an accused even in the absence of supervening circumstances. Following are the illustrative circumstances where the bail can be cancelled:

33.1. Where the Court granting bail takes into account irrelevant material of substantial nature and not trivial nature while ignoring relevant material on record.

33.2. Where the Court granting bail overlooks the influential position of the accused in comparison to the victim of abuse or the witnesses especially when there is prima facie misuse of position and power over the victim.

33.3. Where the past criminal record and conduct of the accused is completely ignored while granting bail.

33.4. Where bail has been granted on untenable grounds.

33.5. Where serious discrepancies are found in the order granting bail thereby causing prejudice to justice.



33.6. Where the grant of bail was not appropriate in the first place given the very serious nature of the charges against the accused which disentitles him for bail and thus cannot be justified.

33.7. When the order granting bail is apparently whimsical, capricious and perverse in the facts of the given case.”

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to indicate any reasons necessitating cancellation of bail granted to respondents No.2 to 4 and nowhere it has been indicated that the sanctity of the trial will be adversely affected, if respondents No. 2 to 4 continue to enjoy the concession of bail. Trite to say that the scope of interference by the Courts qua cancellation of bail is rather limited, and that mere uncorroborated averments cannot be made the sole basis to do the same.

11. In view of the above discussion, this Court is of the considered view that the cancellation of bail granted to respondents No. 2 to 4 would not meet the objective standard of reason and justice. Learned counsel for the petitioner has been unable to indicate any perversity in the impugned orders, or demonstrate any conduct on the part of respondents No. 2 to 4 that would warrant interference by this Court.

12. In view of the aforesaid and in light of the judgments cited herein above, the petition is dismissed.

13. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

April 08th, 2026
Gurpreet Singh

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