



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

(133+251)

CRM-M-25981-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 13.05.2026

SUNIL SINGH

. . . Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. G.S. Sawhney, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Anupam Bhanot, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

CRM-21076-2026

The instant application is for impleading the complainant as respondent No. 2 in the present petition

The application is allowed as prayed for.

The complainant is impleaded as respondent No. 2 in the present petition.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place.

CRM-M-25981-2026 (main case)

1. This is the second petition under Section 482 of BNSS (corresponding Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.64 dated 20.05.2025 (Annexure P-1) under Section 85 of BNS (Section 498-A of IPC) and lateron added Section 115(2) of BNS (Section 323 of IPC) vide rapat no.37 dated 03.03.2026 (Annexure P-2),



registered at Police Station City Jalalabad, District Fazilka.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the complainant on the sweeping allegations of demand of dowry and harassment. It is submitted that the marriage of the petitioner and the complainant was solemnized about 02 years prior to the registration of the present FIR. However, on account of matrimonial disputes the instant FIR was got lodged, that too after a delay of about 06 months. It is also submitted that the petitioner had neither asked for any financial assistance or dowry from the complainant or her family, nor is there any material on record to substantiate the vague averments made in the FIR.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 have vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and submit that there are specific and serious allegations against the petitioner. They state that the petitioner was actively involved in the commission of the offence.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions from the investigating officer concerned, submits that the first petition for anticipatory bail filed by the petitioner under Section 85 BNS was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 05.02.2026. She further submits that subsequently, Section 115(2) BNS was added on 03.03.2026, pursuant to which the petitioner has preferred the present petition seeking anticipatory bail. Learned State counsel has also placed on record the MLR of the complainant, which reflects that she had sustained two injuries, including multiple reddish abrasions on the neck; and had even experienced loss of hearing in her left ear, due to the violent assault by the petitioner.



5. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. A perusal of the case record reveals that the first petition seeking anticipatory bail was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 05.02.2026.

7. Proceeding to adjudicate this second petition, it is observed that *prima facie*, serious and specific allegations of demand of dowry and physical cruelty against his wife, are levelled against the petitioner. The allegations of domestic violence are *prima facie* substantiated by medical evidence, which reflects that the complainant suffered from abrasions on the neck, and even loss of hearing to a certain extent in her left ear.

8. Needless to say that the severity of physical harm in matrimonial disputes need not breach the threshold of grievous injury for it to warrant legal action. Every act of violence, possess the capacity to erode the sanctity of marital trust and compromise the fundamental dignity of the individual, and constitutes a violation of their personal integrity and autonomy. It is imperative, therefore, that a zero- tolerance approach is adopted in such cases, lest such acts end up becoming potential precursors to more severe violence.

9. The position of law is settled that the concession of anticipatory bail, which is an extraordinary relief, cannot be granted on the mere asking of the petitioner. There must be an existence of exceptional circumstances in his favour so as to warrant the Court to extend this concession. Regrettably, there is nothing in the pleadings made on behalf of the petitioner, so as to make out the existence of any such exception, so as to make him entitled for grant of concession of anticipatory bail.



2026.PHHC:075317



2026:PHHC:075317

CRM-M-25981-2026 (O&M)

-4-

10. Therefore, having regard to the gravity of the alleged offences and the *prima facie* material on record, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

11. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

May 13, 2026

Ritika

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>