

212

CRM-M-72469-2025

-1-



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

CRM-M-72469-2025

Date of decision: 11.02.2026

HARJINDER SINGH @ JINDER AND ANR.

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. H.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, DAG Punjab.

Mr. Vishal Verma, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.128 dated 02.08.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 331(6), 190, 191(3), 351(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and sections 109, 117(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (added later on) registered at Police Station Nabha, District Patiala.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that a dispute arose between petitioners and Complainant due to party faction in the village in which the complainant and his grandfather suffered injuries

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present FIR was registered on 02.08.2025 and on 06.10.2025 the petitioners were



Patiala. He further submits that on 13.10.2025 the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala dismissed their Anticipatory bail application in spite of the statement given by the investigating officer that the petitioners have joined investigation and have assisted in recoveries of weapons used in offence. Hence the present petition.

4. At this juncture, learned counsel for petitioners submits that the petitioners have already joined investigation and have fully co-operated in it. He further submits that the weapons of offence have already been recovered and nothing more is required to be recovered from them. He further submits that the present dispute has version and cross-version and emanates out of party faction dispute in village. Hence, he prays that present petition be allowed.

5. Learned State counsel, concedes the fact that the petitioners had joined the investigation and the weapons of offence have been recovered on their disclosures. He, on instructions from ASI Ravinder Singh submits that the custodial interrogation of petitioners is not required.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners and submits that they have given multiple injuries to the complainant and his grandfather. Hence, they do not deserve any relief.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala had granted interim bail to the petitioners to allow them to join the investigation but the same was

dismissed later on.



8. In the peculiar facts of the present case, since the petitioners had joined the investigation; got the weapons of offence recovered; the learned counsel for state has stated that their custodial interrogation is no longer required; the culpability of the petitioners is a matter of trial; hence, this Court is of the view that the present petition deserves merit.

9. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. The petitioners shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

10. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11.02.2026
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No