



106

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

**CRM-M-33588-2026
DECIDED ON: 11.06.2026**

PARAMJIT KAUR @ PARAMJIT KAUR SIDHU

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under section 482 The Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanita (BNSS), 2023 (Erstwhile Section 438 of CrPC) for grant of Anticipatory Bail in case FIR No.67 dated 17.04.2026 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 115 (2), 298, 351 (3), 3 (5) of 'The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 (Earlier Sections 323, 295, 506, 34 of IPC), subsequently added Section 110, 117 (2) and 238 of BNS, 2023 (Earlier Section 308, 325 and 201 of IPC), registered at Police Station Hathur, Ludhiana.

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the present FIR is the counter blast of the



2026:PHHC:087276

CRM-M-33588-2026

FIR No.36 dated 25.02.2026 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 3(5) and 118(2) of BNS, 2023 (earlier Sections 323, 324, 34 and 326 of IPC) (Annexure P-7), which was registered on the statement of Gurmail Singh against Jaspreet Singh son of Ajmer Singh, Pradeep Singh, son of Sohan Singh, Balwinder Kaur, wife of Sohan Singh and Ajmer Singh, son of Bachan Singh, and the husband of the petitioner namely Gurmeet Singh, who is a witness in the above-mentioned FIR. It is argued on behalf of the petitioner that allegations against the petitioner is baseless. He undertakes on behalf of the petitioner that he is ready and willing to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. DAG Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State, whereas Mr. J.S. Uppal, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of complainant and filed his vakalatnama, which is taken on record. Both prays for dismissal of the present petition on the ground that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused persons inflicted injuries on the person of the complainant.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given due consideration to the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and particularly to the fact that the matter arises out of version and cross-version and the State has not been able to place on record any incriminating material connecting the petitioner with the alleged offence, this Court is of the considered view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted.

In the light of above, there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

11.06.2026

Meenu

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No