



108  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-71650-2025  
DECIDED ON: 22.04.2026

MANINDER SINGH .....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB .....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Manjot Gujral, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, seeking pre-arrest bail in case FIR No. 256 dated 31.10.2025, under Sections 115(2), 351(2), 324(4), 3(5) and 333 of BNS, registered at Police Station Sadar, District Ludhiana.

2. On 18.12.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

- “i) xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx  
ii) xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx  
iii) *As per allegations, on 28.10.2025 at about 7:45 p.m, when complainant-Manjit Singh was present in his Salon two persons namely, Maninder Singh @ Mani and one unknown person entered therein and ransacked the salon of the complainant.*  
iv) *Petitioner-Manjinder Singh @ Mani, was armed with a hockey stick, while an unknown boy was armed with an iron rod. As per allegations, petitioner gave hockey blow and unkown person gave blow with an iron rod on the head of the complainant. Another blow allegedly given by petitioner-Manjinder Singh, was protected by the injured, as the blow hit on the left wrist. The injured sustained four injuries; however, the medical opinion regarding the nature of these injuries is still awaited.*



- v) *Notice of motion for 13.01.2026.*
- vi) *Respondent-State is directed to file a status report detailing the medical opinion regarding the injuries sustained by the complainant.*
- vii) *Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner's joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondents."*

3. Today, learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that the injured sustained total four injuries, all of which have been declared to be simple in nature. It is further submitted that, as per the NCCT Head report, it is recorded that **"no fresh bony injury is seen corresponding to the injury in MLR."**

4. Mr. Ankit Joshi, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his *vakalatnama* in Court today, which is taken on record.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the accused persons trespassed into the shop (salon) of the injured and thereafter caused injuries, and therefore, the offences are non-bailable in nature. Thus, it is contended that petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record available on file.

7. It is a significant factual aspect that the alleged incident took place on 28.10.2025; however, complaint was moved for the first time without any explanation of the delay, FIR came to be registered only on 31.10.2025.



Moreover, injuries suffered by the injured have been declared to be simple in nature. In the totality of the circumstances, this Court does not find any substantial reason to subject the petitioner to custodial interrogation. **Accordingly, present petition is allowed,** and petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today or as and when called by the investigating officer, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his 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.).

8. 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.

9. However, it shall be open to the prosecution as well as the complainant to seek revival of the present bail order, if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigation, in terms of the directions mentioned in the present order.

10. With the directions recorded here above, present petition stands disposed of.

22.04.2026  
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |