



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

110

CRM-M-16178-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision : 25.03.2026

Suram Singh @Sonu

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Manbir Singh Basra, Advocate and
Mr. Anupinder Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (oral)

This petition for pre-arrest bail is the first petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.45 dated 19.06.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 118(1), 118(2) and 109 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Narot Jaimal Singh, District Pathankot.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Jaideep Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that on 18.06.2025 at about 11:30 am, Bhupinder Singh @Goldi, Suram Singh @Sonu (petitioner herein), Chanchala Devi and Raama Devi had entered his house. According to complainant, at that point of time Bhupinder Singh @Goldi and Suram



Singh @Sonu (petitioner herein), were armed with Datar, and that they launched an attack upon complainant's father Charanjiv Singh and inflicted various injuries on his person.

3. **Notice of motion.**

4. Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG Punjab appears on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner although named in the FIR was not found guilty by the Investigating Agency, and that he was exonerated. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, initially vide final report under Section 173 CrPC, the petitioner was not prosecuted, but during the course of trial, the learned trial Court invoked the provisions contained in Section 319 CrPC and summoned the petitioner, as an additional accused. It has been further contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner and therefore, his custodial interrogation is not required.

7. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, the injury attributed to the petitioner is serious in nature, and that in view of gravity of offence, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of pre-arrest bail.

8. The record has been perused carefully.



9. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision:-

- i. that vide report under Section 173 of CrPC, the petitioner was not prosecuted, as according to the Investigating Agency, he was innocent;
- ii. that since the petitioner has been summoned under Section 319 of CrPC, and therefore, further investigation qua petitioner is not going to take place;
- iii. that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- iv. that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- v. that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vi. that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- vii. that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- viii. that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

10. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of pre-arrest bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.



11. In view of the above-mentioned discussion, the present petition is hereby ***allowed*** and the petitioner is accorded the benefit of pre-arrest bail. It is hereby directed that in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. The petitioner will join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

25.03.2026

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No