



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104-2

CRM-M-70413-2025
Decided on: 23.04.2026

SUBHAM

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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 First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Subham, aged about 22 years	143	18.10.2025	115(2), 109, 191(3), 190, 351(3) of BNS and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act	Basti Jodhewal	Ludhiana

2. On 15.12.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, submits that as per the FIR lodged by the complainant Aarti Sharma, incident took place on 18.10.2025 at around 2:20 p.m., during which there



was an exchange of heated words followed by a scuffle, wherein the accused persons allegedly caused injuries to the complainant party. It is, however, pointed out that although, petitioner was present at the spot, he has not been attributed any specific injury, nor he was armed with any weapon at the time of the incident.

3. *It is further submitted that, insofar as the role attributed to the petitioner is concerned, his alleged presence is limited only to the initial phase of the incident, i.e., prior to the arrival of other armed co-accused, namely Deepak Kumar, Munish Gupta, and Amarjit Singh, during whose arrival the alleged incident of firing is stated to have taken place. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose for the prosecution. Moreover, petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to fully cooperate with the investigating agency, provided he is granted protection from arrest by this Court.*

4. *Additionally, it is submitted that co-accused namely Priya Sharma @ Sanchi and Sanjay Sharma, have already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, vide orders dated 12.11.2025 and 03.12.2025, passed in CRM-M-63408-2025 and CRM-M-68166-2025 (Annexures P-2 and P-3), respectively. Thus, it is prayed that concession of anticipatory bail be also extended to the petitioner in the present case.*

5. *Notice of motion.*

6. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his vakalatnama in Court today, which is taken on record.*

7. *Learned counsel for the complainant submits that role of the petitioner is clearly established from the CCTV footage, wherein present petitioner can be seen grappling with the victim party at the time of the incident.*

8. *Adjourned to 19.12.2025.*

9. *To be heard along with CRM-M-70363-2025.*

10. *Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also*



abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

11. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he 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.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 15.12.2025, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 15.12.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.



CRM-M-70413-2025

4

8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

9. It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

10. It is further clarified that in case, any threat is issued by the petitioner to the complainant or her family members, in any manner, it shall be open for the prosecution and complainant to move an appropriate application for cancellation of the present bail order.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

23.04.2026

Lavisha

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