



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

218

CRM-M-17389-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.04.2025

Jagroop Singh @ Bhupi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.13 dated 18.02.2025 under Section 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran.

2. On 28.03.2025, the following order was passed:-

“XX XX XX XX
Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by twisting the actual facts and giving it a criminal colour, as he is part of a notorious syndicate, who is carrying out extortions. The real facts are that FIR No.12 dated 18.02.2025 under Sections 329(3), 62, 305, 331(4), 3(5) of BNS was registered, at Police Station Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran, on the statement made by one Jasmeet Singh that the petitioner along with co-accused are trying to take forcible possession of the land owned by his paternal uncle, who is settled in Malaysia.



Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to an order dated 13.03.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, vide which anticipatory bail has been granted to the petitioner and submits that it has been recorded in para No.8 of the said order that paternal uncle of Jasmeet Singh, namely Asa Singh, died long time back on 10.12.1985 and his son Naranya Singh had executed a Power of Attorney in favour of co-accused Mangal Singh, as such, the dispute between the parties is civil in nature regarding some land. It is further contended that the petitioner is not named in the FIR (supra) and he has been nominated as accused on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused while he was in police custody, which has no evidentiary value in the eyes of law, as the same is hit by Section 25 of Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (now Section 23(1)(2) of Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023).

Notice of motion.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is involved in three cases and allegations against him are serious in nature.

Adjourned to 28.04.2025.

*Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137; Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565, Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State of NCT Delhi 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833**, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner will be admitted to interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973).*



If the Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, he would appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.”

- 3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from SI Jassa Singh, at the very outset, informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.
- 4. In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 28.03.2025 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS (*erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973*).
- 5. The petition stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

28.04.2025
yakub

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