



CRM-M-22763-2025

1

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

102

**CRM-M-22763-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.05.2025**

Nardev Singh @ Bobby Mann

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Bipan Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate and
Mr. Akhil Godara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S.Walia, AAG, Punjab.

Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Raghav Gulati, Advocate for *de facto* complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.142 dated 05.10.2024 (P-1), under Sections 109, 115(2), 351(2) and 191(3) read with Section 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station City Jalalabad, District Fazilka.

2. Status report by way of affidavit dated 03.05.2025 of Mr. Jatinder Singh Gill, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division, Jalalabad on behalf of respondent has been filed and the same is taken on record. Copy supplied to the other side.

Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

3. Allegations are that petitioner along with other co-accused formed an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of their common object, he



CRM-M-22763-2025

2

fired gunshot upon complainant party, with an intention to kill and also criminally intimidated them with dire consequences.

4. Contends that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case due to political rivalry. Further contends that no fire-arm injury has been attributed to petitioner and he is having clean antecedents. Lastly contends that petitioner is ready to join the investigation, but he be protected.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as well as learned Senior counsel for *de facto* complainant vehemently opposed the prayer while submitting that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature; he had inflicted injuries by firing gun-shot with an intention to kill complainant-Gurpreet Singh and Rajesh Kumar. Further submits that in view of the gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of pre-arrest bail. Lastly submits that petitioner is very influential person being son of a former Member of Parliament (MP) and in case he is released on pre-arrest bail, there is every likelihood of interfering with fair investigation.

6. Heard learned counsel for both the sides and perused the paper book.

7. There is no quarrel that petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR. Police papers reveal that petitioner, armed with revolver along with other co-accused was present in the office of BDPO on the fateful day. It is discernible that shots were fired by co-accused Vardev Singh @ Noni Mann and present petitioner (Bobby Mann). Further discernible that petitioner fired two shots which hit left hand of injured Rajesh Kumar; whereas shot fired by Vardev Singh @ Noni Mann hit injured Mandeep Singh and injury has been declared as grievous and dangerous to life.

8. Also noteworthy that petitioner is involved in three other

criminal cases and which are as under:-

Sr. No.	FIR Nos and date	Sections	Police Station
1.	146 dated 10.08.2022	3(1)(s) of Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and Section 323 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, 'IPC')	Vairoke
2.	129 dated 12.06.2002	188, 379, 324, 323, 506 and 148 read with Section 149 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959	Sadar Jalalabad
3.	123 dated 26.11.2015	406 and 148 read with Section 149 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959	Sadar, Shri Muktsar Sahib

9. Apart that, it is categorically alleged that second shot fired by petitioner hit left hand of injured Rajesh Kumar; therefore, his complicity is well apparent.
10. In view of the above, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be very much necessary to recover the weapon of offence used by him during alleged occurrence and to know the true facts of case.
- 10 Consequently, there is no option, but to dismiss the petition.
11. Ordered accordingly.
12. Needless to say that above observations be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of allegations, in any manner.
- Pending application(s), if any shall also stands disposed off.