



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

151

CRM-M-29844-2025

Date of decision: May 27th, 2025

Manjot Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. P.S. Walia and
Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocates
for the petitioners.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioners are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.57 dated 01.04.2025 under section 115(2), 126(2), 191(3), 190, 324(4), 125 of the BNS and Section 25 of The Arms act (Section 109 of the BNS added later on) registered at Police Station Division No.6, Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has vehemently contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case due to a long standing political rivalry between the families of the complainant and the accused. He submits that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioners and that the allegations are general and vague in nature. While inviting the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR (Annexure P-1), it has been further submitted that the injuries allegedly sustained by the complainant are definitely self-inflicted and that the petitioners are being targeted to settle personal scores. It is also argued that the FIR is, therefore, nothing but an abuse of the process of law aimed at harassing the petitioners.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the relevant material on record.

4. A perusal of the FIR reveals that serious and specific allegations have been levelled against both the petitioners. Allegedly on 31.03.2025 when the complainant and his friends were returning after dinner, they were attacked by the accused, including the present petitioners, in a premeditated and violent manner. Petitioner-Navjot Singh is specifically attributed the act of assaulting the complainant with a *kada* on the forehead and teeth, while co-accused Jagjit Singh is alleged to have assaulted the complainant with the butt of a pistol, fired gunshots in the air, and even aimed a pistol at one of the associates of the complainant. The accused thereafter allegedly damaged vehicles belonged to the associates of the complainant by pelting bricks.

5. The allegations are not only grave but *prima facie* demonstrate the active and direct involvement of the petitioners in the commission of the offence. The nature of the injuries, the use of weapons, and the brazenness of the assault lend credence to the prosecution version and cannot be brushed aside at this stage.

6. Additionally, this Court cannot lose sight of the criminal antecedents of the petitioners as they are already facing trial in another criminal case registered under Section 307 of the IPC and The Arms Act. Notably, the present occurrence took place while the petitioners were on bail in the said earlier case. It, therefore, clearly indicates a deliberate misuse of the liberty earlier granted to them by the Court.

7. Given the totality of circumstances, including the gravity of the offence and the manner in which it was committed, specific and *prima facie* corroborated role attributed to each petitioner, as also their previous involvement in a similar offence, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

9. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

May 27th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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