



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

111

CRM-M-74029-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.03.2026

ROOP LAL AND OTHERS

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Bhavuk Datta, Advocate for the complainant.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.189 dated 05.12.2025, under Sections 109, 118(1), 115(2), 191(3), 190 and 117(2) BNS, registered at Police Station Bhogpur, District Jalandhar Rural.
2. On 24.02.2026, the Co-ordinate Bench had passed the following order:-

“Main case

1. This petition for pre-arrest bail, which is first petition filed by the petitioners under Section 482 of ‘the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023’, has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.189 dated 05.12.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 109, 118(1), 115(2), 191(3), 190 and 117(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Bhogpur, District Jalandhar Rural.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of Baldev Singh, hereinafter being referred to as complainant only. It was stated by the complainant that on 03.12.2025 at about 08:00 PM, he was present at his home and heard a commotion. As per complainant when he came out of his home, he found that Satpal Singh @ Sattu, Sameer and Surjit Singh @ Seetu were hurling abuses. According to complainant when Bhagat Singh tried to stop them, they caught hold of Bhagat Singh and inflicted injuries on his person with a sharp edged weapon. The complainant further alleged that one of the injuries suffered by Bhagat Singh was on his head and it was caused with a sharp edged weapon.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned information, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that both the parties are residents of the same locality and with the

intervention of respectables of the society, they have entered into compromise. As per learned counsel for the petitioners the compromise has already been reduced into writing, and that the copy of the same has been placed on record. It has also been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that both the parties have decided to file a petition seeking for quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise.

6. The learned counsel for the complainant has filed the Power of Attorney today. The same be taken on record. The learned counsel for the complainant has conceded that a compromise between the parties has taken place.

7. However, the learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel the offence committed by the petitioners are non-compoundable, and therefore, on the basis of compromise no benefit can be accorded to the petitioners.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record shows that in the present case the plea raised by learned counsel for the petitioners, with regard to compromise cannot have any impact as the offence is compoundable. However, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision:-

- i) that the petitioners and complainant are resident of the same locality;
- ii) that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents;
- iii) that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital;
- iv) that the recovery of weapon of offence can be facilitated by giving a direction to the petitioners to join investigation;
- v) that the detention of petitioners in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vi) that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- vii) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioners are likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- ix) that there is nothing on record to show that while on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioners will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

10. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above-mentioned factors, it is hereby held that the petitioners are entitled for interim anticipatory bail.

11. Thus, the benefit of interim anticipatory bail is accorded to the petitioner, and it is hereby ordered that in the event of their arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. The petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. They shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023.

12. List on 11.03.2026.”

3. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the afore-mentioned order, the petitioners have not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, they shall make themselves available without demur.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Karnail Singh affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioners and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioners are not required for further custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioners is allowed and the order dated 24.02.2026 granting interim bail to them, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

6. However, it is made clear that if the petitioners fail to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to them.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

17.03.2026

ashok

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