



2026:PHHC:044140

2026:PHHC:044140

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

106

CRM-M-64581-2025 (O&amp;M)

Date of decision: 20.03.2026

Monu and Another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present : Mr. A.S. Manaise, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No. 173 dated 08.10.2025 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(3), 191(3) and 190 of the BNS, registered at Police Station Jalandhar Cantt., District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

2. On 09.03.2026, this Court had passed the following order:-

“This is first petition under Section 482 BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No. 173 dated 08.10.2025 under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(3), 191(3) and 190 of the BNS, registered at Police Station Jalandhar Cantt., District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar.

As per the allegations in the FIR, on 04.10.2025 at about 09:20 PM, the complainant Rajesh Kumar Arora along with his wife Reeta Arora was returning home after closing their shop when three persons came on a motorcycle bearing No. PB-35-AJ-3649 and started quarrelling with them. One of the assailants allegedly gave a dattar blow on the fingers of the complainant's right hand, another blow on his right shoulder and a third blow on his knee. The assailants allegedly threatened the complainant to withdraw the case pending against Pooja. The complainant was thereafter taken to Johal Hospital, Jalandhar for treatment. During investigation, the said motorcycle was traced and CCTV footage was collected. The owner of the motorcycle, Parladh



Bhatti of Pathankot, stated that he had given the motorcycle to his friend Mohit Atri, who in turn disclosed that the motorcycle had been taken by Monu and Gourav Kumar (present petitioners) on the relevant day. On this basis, the petitioners were nominated as accused in the present case. As per the MLR, the complainant suffered injuries on his right knee, right hand fingers and right elbow joint.

It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have not been named in the FIR and the same has been registered after four days of the alleged occurrence against unknown persons. It is further submitted that the petitioners have been nominated during investigation on the basis of the statement of Prahlad Bhatti, the owner of the motorcycle allegedly used in the occurrence, who stated that he had given the said motorcycle to his friend Mohit Atri. The said Mohit Atri, when joined in the investigation, made a disclosure statement to the effect that on the date of occurrence, the said motorcycle had been taken from him by the present petitioners. On the basis of the said disclosure statement, the petitioners have been nominated in the present case. Learned counsel further submits that as per the MLR, three injuries have been found on the person of the complainant, i.e. on the right knee, fingers and elbow, which are non-vital parts of the body and all the injuries have been declared to be simple in nature. It is contended that the only non-bailable offence attracted in the present case is under Section 118(1) of the BNS, 2023 and, therefore, the petitioners deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that serious allegations of causing injuries to the complainant have been levelled against the petitioners and they are the principal perpetrators who had assaulted the complainant. Although, they were not named in the FIR, their names have surfaced during investigation on the basis of the disclosure statement made by Mohit Atri and, therefore, they are not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case. The petitioners were not named in the FIR, which was lodged after a delay of four days and initially registered against unknown persons. Their names have surfaced during investigation on the basis of the disclosure statement of a coaccused. As per the MLR, the injuries attributed to the petitioners are on the right knee, fingers and elbow of the complainant, which are non-vital parts of the body and all the injuries have been declared to be simple in nature. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, this Court deems it appropriate to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, in the event of their arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim anticipatory bail.



**CRM-M-64581-2025 (O&M)**

**2026:PHHC:044140**

subject to their joining the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer and subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023.

List on 20.03.2026. ”

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 petitioners to appear, they shall make themselves available without demur.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions 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 09.03.2026 granting interim bail to them, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) BNSS.

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**

**20.03.2026**

M.Kamra

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