



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

**CRM-M No.37472 of 2026
Date of Decision:-21.07.2026**

Sarabjit Singh

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. R.K. Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Munish Puri, Advocate
for the complainant.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition preferred by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'the BNSS') is for the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.112 dated 09.06.2026 registered under Sections 109, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Ghuman, District Batala.

2. On the statement of one Satnam Singh, the FIR in question was registered with the following allegations:-

"Statement of Satnam Singh son of Harbans Singh resident of Attepur, Police Station Ghuman, District Gurdaspur aged about 64 years mobile number 9417260705 Stated that I am resident of above said address and doing the

work of agricultural, We are two brothers and three sisters, all of us are married, my land adjacent to the passage. On the other hand, I have also land measuring 02 kanal 13 marla. I was lying a pipe for irrigation of my land which is situated both the sides of passage and along with my land, there is land of Sarabjit Singh son of Pritam resident of Attepur, when I was getting a pipe to water my land, the time was around 06-30 PM. Sarabjit Singh son of Pritam Singh armed double barrel rifle, Rachpal Singh son of Pritam Singh armed Kripaan, Rajwant Kaur wife Sarabjit Singh empty handed all residents Attepur came on the road in front of my house and started abusing and openly threatening to kill us. We left the pipe there and went toward our home. Rachpal Singh raised lalkara and said to Sarabjit Singh who had a double barrel rifle in his hand. Don't let him and teach him lesson for putting the pipe today. Sarabjit Singh abused me by name and pointed his riffle towards me and fired two shots at me with the intention of killing me. I got scared and fell on the ground to protect myself, then the whole family by abusing and threatening me went toward their home. Grudge of dispute is that my 2 kanal 13 marla land is on the other side of the road adjacent to the land of Sarabjit Singh and others and they want that land should not be irrigated and due to upset, I should sell it to them. Today, they have fired at me with the intention to kill me, I am complainant action should be taken. Sd/- Punjabi Satnam Singh Attested Sd/- Satnam Singh ASI Incharge Outpost Udhanwal Police Station Ghuman Date 09.06.2026.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and a pure civil dispute has been given the colour of a criminal case. He further submits that even if the allegations,

for the sake of arguments, are taken to be correct, it is a case of no injury caused to anyone on account of the alleged opening of fire. Learned counsel submits that one of the co-accused has already been arrested and another has been granted anticipatory bail by the trial Court. Learned counsel submits that no purpose would be served by custodial interrogation of the petitioner as the petitioner has already surrendered his gun. He further submits that the antecedents of the petitioner are clean and he is willing to join investigation and abide by any condition imposed by the Court.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant have opposed the bail application. A video recording has been produced in which the petitioner is seen opening fire with a double barrel gun.

5. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. The allegation against the petitioner is that he opened fire on the complainant side with his double barrel gun. The fact that nobody got hurt or injured in the said shoot out is hardly of any consequence and the act of opening fire itself constitutes an offence. Considering the nature of the allegation, this Court does not find it to be a case where the concession of anticipatory bail should be extended to the petitioner.

7. That being so, the petition is found to be devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

July 21, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No