



217

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

CRM-M-2026-2025**Date of Decision: 22.01.2025**

Tarbir Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**Present :** Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Supneet Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Jaibir Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2/ complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.133 dated 05.12.2024, registered under Sections 125, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Sarai Amant Khan, District Tarn Taran.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Angrej Singh son of Baldev Singh and the same has been reproduced below:-

“Statement of Angrej Singh S/o Baldev Singh S/o Shingra Singh, resident of Kasel, aged about 35 years, Mobile No. 9915977260 states that I am resident of the above-mentioned address and work privately in the road department. Today, at around 9 AM, I was leaving my house on my motorcycle bearing



No, PB02BP7044, make Hero Honda Splendor, to drop my children at school. While passing through the bank chownk in the village then I saw that Tarbir Singh @ Rulda @ Rajbir Singh S/o Tarsem Singh @ Rajha, Arjan Singh @ Kalu S/o Malkit Singh @ Meeta and Rajdeep Singh @ Kalu S/o Avtar Singh, all residents of Kasel, standing in the chownk. Along with them, there were 2-3 unidentified persons present as well. On seeing me, they immediately started abusing me and said, 'This man files complaints against us. Let's teach him a lesson for filing complaints. In the meantime, Arjan Singh @ Kalu and Rajdeep Singh @ Kalu catch hold me and started punching me. Tarbir Singh @ Rulda @ Rajbir Singh pulled out his pistol and started firing on me, with an intention to kill me. Upon listening raula, my brother namely Narvinder Singh S/o Baldev Singh rushed to the spot from the house. While Tarbir Singh @ Rulda @ Rajbir Singh continued firing with the intent to kill and abovementioned accused while giving abuses, ran away from the spot. My brother Narvinder Singh witnessed the entire incident with his own eyes. I was on my way to report the matter and you met us. Action be taken against the above mentioned person. Statement has been recorded, heard and is correct. Sd/- Angrej Singh, Attested Sd/- Narinder Singh ASI, P.S. Sarai Amanat Khan dated 05.12.2024.....”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had never fired on the complainant and no such occurrence has taken place. As per him, it was a case of no injury as no person was hurt in the present incident. Learned counsel further contends that it has been falsely alleged by the complainant that he had moved complaints against the petitioner, whereas the complainant had not moved any complaint against the petitioner and there was no motive on the part of the petitioner to commit the alleged crime.



4. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in one more case of similar nature. Apart from that, on the date of incident, the complainant had gone to drop his children at the school on motorcycle and the petitioner alongwith other accused had waylaid them and fired pistol shots at him. However, luckily the complainant escaped unhurt. Learned counsel further submits that two empty cartridges have been recovered from the place of occurrence, which clearly proves that the occurrence has taken place and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the weapon of offence.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In the present case, it is apparent that two empty cartridges have been recovered from the place of occurrence and it has been found that the petitioner had fired a shot from pistol. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for effecting the recovery of weapon of offence. Even otherwise, the petitioner is involved in one more case and the Courts should be slow in granting the concession of bail to such a repeat offenders.

7. Thus, findings no merits in the present case, the present petition is ordered to be dismissed.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

22.01.2025
hemlata

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