

263

CRM-M-3641-2025
Decided on: 20.03.2025

Shamsher Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. P.B.S. Goraya, Advocate
Mr. S.S. Bhullar, Advocate and
Mr. S.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate
For the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

* * * *

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
134	29.10.2024	Khilchian, District Amritsar Rural	324(4), 118(1), 115(1), 351, 125, 190, 191(3) BNS and 118(2) BNS added later on vide DDR No.23 dated 12.11.2024 and 25/54/59 of Arms Act

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. In paragraph 10 of the status report it is mentioned that petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“That the brief and relevant facts of the case are that aforesaid FIR No. 134 dated 29.10.2024 was registered on the basis of the statement of Jaspal Singh son of Mahan Singh, who had alleged therein that on 27.10.2024, he, Shubhkarmanjit Singh and Jarmanjit Singh were present near ground of Village Bhinder and at about 10:30 PM, the petitioner, Charandeep Singh and Rajwinder Singh came on Mahindra Tractor driven by the petitioner and hit it in his Balero Car No. PB02-CD-3707

and thereafter the petitioner again hit his aforesaid Balero Car by reversing the tractor and in the meantime, his (Jaspal Singh) associates Gurlal Singh and Nirbhai Singh also came at the spot. He further alleged that in the meantime the co-accused Manjinder Singh, Sukhchain Singh, Amarjit Singh, Tarsem Singh, Harjinder Singh, Avtar Singh, Gurpreet Singh, Sukhmanjit Singh armed with kirpans, danda, baseball bats and other weapons along with 15/16 unidentified persons came over there and the co-accused Charandeep Singh raised a lalkara to catch hold of them for keeping a grudge against them in Panchayat elections and in the meantime the co-accused Harjinder Singh caused injuries upon the left hand and right shoulder of Nirbhai Singh with two consecutive blows of danda, the co-accused Tarsem Singh caused injury on the left arm of Gurlal Singh with a blow of a kirpan. He further alleged that thereafter the co-accused Harjinder Singh caused injury on the left leg of Gurlal Singh with a blow of a kirpan and the co-accused Amarjit Singh caused injuries on back and left arm of Gurlal Singh with two consecutive blows of baseball bat and he along with his associates Shubhkarmanjit Singh and Jarmanjit Singh fled away from the spot and the petitioner and co-accused Manjinder Singh fired upon them and when the injured Nirbhai Singh and Gurlal Singh raised hue and cry for help, all the aforesaid accused fled away from the spot. He further alleged that while getting his Balero Car repaired, he found two bullets shots in his car. The detailed facts mentioned by the complainant Jaspal Singh in his aforesaid statement has been reproduced in the true translation of the aforesaid FIR No. 134 dated 29.10.2024 attached with the petition as Annexure P-1, which may kindly be read as a part of present paragraph as same are not repeated here for the sake of brevity.”

4. The petitioner's counsel seeks bail on parity with co-accused Harjinder Singh who was granted bail by this Court vide order dated 30.01.2025 passed in CRM-M-65332-2024. He further prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“Role of the petitioner

6. That as per the Statement of the Jaspal Singh, the petitioner along with

CRM-M-3641-2025

other co-accused after forming an unlawful assembly in furtherance of their common object had caused injuries upon Gurlal Singh and Nirbhai Singh but no injury has been caused by the petitioner. The petitioner had damaged the Balero Car of the complainant by hitting his tractor directly and by reversing it. Moreover when the complainant and his associates were fleeing away from the spot, the petitioner had fired upon them with his pistol and two bullets hit on Balero Car.”

REASONING:

7. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.
8. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, absence of history and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.
9. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

CONDITIONS:

10. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.
11. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

12. This order is subject to the petitioner’s complying with the following terms. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses,

CRM-M-3641-2025

Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

13. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

14. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter the property, workplace, and residence of the victim until the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial are recorded. This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to *Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation*, 2018 All SCR (CrL.) 458; and *Aparna Bhatt v. The State of Madhya Pradesh*, 2021:INSC:192, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

15. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of release from prison and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

16. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that

CRM-M-3641-2025

they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed.”

17. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

18. It is clarified that if the petitioner violates any bail condition, the State and/or the victim may file an application for bail cancellation before the trial court, which shall be competent to cancel the bail or add more conditions. Furthermore, if the petitioner moves for deletion or dilution of any bail conditions, the trial court is empowered to do so.

19. **This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State may file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall have the liberty to cancel this bail.**

20. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

21. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

22. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

20.03.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.