



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

106

CRM-M-29880-2025

Date of decision: 27.05.2025

Jagmeet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. H.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') in case FIR No.91 dated 30.04.2025 under Sections 333, 115(2), 140(1), 351(2), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNS') (Section 103(1) of the BNS added lateron), registered at Police Station Guruharsahai, District Ferozepur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case and that no specific role has been attributed to him in the FIR annexed as Annexure P-1. It is submitted that the FIR primarily names Sham Lal, his wife, and his son Nishan as the principal accused. The name of the petitioner, it is argued, has surfaced only subsequently in the supplementary statement of the complainant and is based merely on suspicion, without any corroborative material or credible evidence to establish his involvement in the alleged occurrence. Learned counsel has further



CRM-M-29880-2025

emphasised that the petitioner was not present at the scene of crime, and there is no material to connect him to the act of abduction or assault.

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

4. Before proceeding further, it would be apposite to refer to the allegations contained in the FIR. Allegedly on 28.02.2025, the complainant was approached by Veero Bai, along with her son Nishan, with a proposal to invest in a piggery business purportedly run by Sham Lal. It is stated that an amount of Rs.50,000/- was transferred online by the complainant to the account of Komal, daughter of Sham Lal, as an initial investment. However, due to family disputes, the remaining amount was not paid, and the business partnership did not materialise.

5. Subsequently on 30.04.2025 at about 11 a.m., Sham Lal, his wife and his son, accompanied by three unidentified persons, arrived at the residence of the complainant in a car, forcibly broke into the house, assaulted the complainant and her family with baseball bat and wooden sticks, and forcibly abducted her husband Ramesh Singh, with an intent to kill him. The abductors fled the scene, and subsequent attempts to contact them failed as their mobile phones were found switched off.

6. From a perusal of the record, it is evident that petitioner Jagmeet Singh, though not initially named in the FIR in question, was specifically named in the supplementary statement of the complainant. The supplementary statement indicates about the active involvement of



CRM-M-29880-2025

the petitioner in the conspiracy and execution of the abduction and assault. There is a definite and conscious role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the offence.

7. The gravity of the allegations—assault, criminal trespass, abduction with intent to commit murder is of a serious and heinous nature. The material on record, including the supplementary statement of the complainant, *prima facie*, points towards the petitioner's participation in the unlawful assembly that resulted in the incident and subsequent abduction.

8. Anticipatory bail is an extraordinary remedy, not to be granted as a matter of routine, especially in offences involving abduction, violence and apparent intent to commit a more grievous offence. The possibility of tampering with witnesses or influencing the course of investigation cannot be ruled out at this stage if the petitioner is granted the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail. In facts and circumstances and considering the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, no ground is made out to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The instant petition stands dismissed accordingly.

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.

27.05.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

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