

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

2025:PHHC:107036



106

CRM-M-43738-2025

Date of decision: 18.08.2025

Jagdeep Singh @ Gaggi

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Sidhant Bhonsle, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurpartap S. Bhullar, AAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest/anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.31 dated 26.03.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 118(1), 115(2), 126(2), 296, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Sadar Raikot, District Ludhiana Rural.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question reflects that on 22.02.2025, the complainant Dharamveer Singh son of Gurtej Singh resident of Lohatbaddi, Police Station Sadar Raikot, District Ludhiana was present in his house. At around 07:15 PM he heard noise outside his house and on hearing the same he reached at the main road. His younger brother Karamvir Singh aged 19 years was purchasing vegetables. The petitioner (herein) , Bhupa Singh & Ambi came there on Bajaj Chetak scooter and started abusing his brother. They also gave beatings to Karamvir Singh. Jagdeep

Singh was armed with Iron Axe. He gave Axe blow on his right elbow. Bhoopa gave three iron pipe blows on the person of Karamvir Singh. His brother Karamvir Singh raised *raula*. Number of persons gathered there. Paramvir Singh other brother of the complainant and his mother Manjit Kaur also reached at the spot and tried to save Karamvir Singh from the clutches of accused persons. The petitioner (herein) gave Axe blow on the left hand of Complainant and he alongwith co-accused also surrounded his brother Paramvir Singh. Co-accused Ambi gave Iron Pipe blow on his left arm and shoulders. Thereafter all accused ran away with their weapons on their respective vehicles. The complainant in furtherance stated that motive for the occurrence is that petitioner (herein) and co-accused are supporting the present Sarpanch Sandeep Kaur and they voted for the opposite candidate. On these set of allegations, instant FIR under Sections 118(1), 115(2), 126(2), 296, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question, as there is a delay of 32 days in lodging of the FIR. Learned counsel has further argued that allegations levelled against the petitioner are baseless as the same have been made by the informant without any basis and the present FIR just a counter-blast. Learned counsel further stated that on the date of incident i.e. 22.02.2025 the petitioner had gone to the market where he was attacked by the complainant alongwith his brothers. Learned counsel has further submitted that a representation dated 24.02.2025 was also moved by the father of the petitioner to the local police station for taking appropriate steps, but no action has been taken on the same. He has also referred to the MLR dated 22.02.2025 of the petitioner. Learned counsel asserts that in the instant

case, the FIR fails to include material facts regarding the conduct of the complainant party which further raised questions about its credibility and fairness. It is next submitted by the learned counsel that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner or at his instance. Moreover, the custodial interrogation should not be used as a punitive measure and is justified only when it is absolutely necessary for the recovery of material evidence. Furthermore, the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and hence no useful purpose would be served by sending him behind the bars. It is lastly submitted by the learned counsel that the present petition be allowed and the petitioner be granted the concession of the anticipatory bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. Learned State counsel has iterated that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is imperative for the purpose of effective and fair investigation, particularly in view of the fact that the weapon of offence is yet to be recovered from the petitioner. According to learned State counsel, in case the petitioner is granted the concession of pre-arrest bail, at this stage, it may impede the ongoing investigation, obstruct recovery and adversely effect the efforts to apprehend the remaining co-accused.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available record of the case.

6. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as ***Kishor Vishwasrao Patil vs. Deepak Yashwant Patil and another*** passed in ***SLP(Crl) No.1125-2022***, relevant whereof reads as under:

“74. Ordinarily, arrest is a part of the process of the investigation intended to secure several purposes. There may be circumstances in which the accused may provide information leading to discovery of material facts and relevant information. Grant of anticipatory bail may hamper the investigation. Pre-arrest bail is to strike a balance between the individual's right to personal freedom and the right of the investigating agency to interrogate the accused as to the material so far collected and to collect more information which may lead to recovery of relevant information.

xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx

75. Observing that the arrest is a part of the investigation intended to secure several purposes, in **Adri Dharan Das v. State of W.B. [Adri Dharan Das v. State of W.B., (2005) 4 SCC 303 : 2005 SCC (Cri) 933]** , it was held as under : (SCC p. 313, para 19)

“19. Ordinarily, arrest is a part of the process of investigation intended to secure several purposes. The accused may have to be questioned in detail regarding various facets of motive, preparation, commission and aftermath of the crime and the connection of other persons, if any, in the crime. There may be circumstances in which the accused may provide information leading to discovery of material facts. It may be necessary to curtail his freedom in order to enable the investigation to proceed without hindrance and to protect witnesses and persons connected with the victim of the crime, to prevent his disappearance, to maintain law and order in the locality. For these or other reasons, arrest may become an inevitable part of the process of investigation. The legality of the proposed arrest cannot be gone into in an application under Section 438 of the Code. The role of the investigator is well defined and the jurisdictional scope of interference by the court in the process of investigation is limited. The court ordinarily will not interfere with the investigation of a crime or with the arrest of the accused in a cognizable offence. An interim order restraining arrest, if passed while dealing with an application under Section 438 of the Code will amount to interference in the investigation, which cannot, at any rate, be done under Section 438 of the Code.”

76. In **Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra [Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, (2011) 1 SCC 694 : (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 514]**, the Supreme Court laid down the factors and parameters to be considered while dealing with anticipatory bail. It was held that the nature and the gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made

and that the court must evaluate the available material against the accused very carefully. It was also held that the court should also consider whether the accusations have been made only with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting him or her.

77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre [**Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, (2011) 1 SCC 694 : (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 514**] and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar [**Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar, (2012) 4 SCC 379 : (2012) 2 SCC (Cri) 468**] , the Supreme Court held as under : (SCC p. 386, para 19)

*“19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroled in the crime and would not misuse his liberty. (See D.K. Ganesh Babu v. P.T. Manokaran [**D.K. Ganesh Babu v. P.T. Manokaran, (2007) 4 SCC 434 : (2007) 2 SCC (Cri) 345**] , State of Maharashtra v. Mohd. Sajid Husain Mohd. S. Husain [**State of Maharashtra v. Mohd. Sajid Husain Mohd. S. Husain, (2008) 1 SCC 213 : (2008) 1 SCC (Cri) 176**] and Union of India v. Padam Narain Aggarwal [**Union of India v. Padam Narain Aggarwal, (2008) 13 SCC 305 : (2009) 1 SCC (Cri) 1**] .)”*

Economic offences

78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain [**Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain, (1998) 2 SCC 105 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 510**], it was held that in economic offences, the accused is not entitled to anticipatory bail.”

15. In Sushila Agrawal and others v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Another reported in (2020) 5 SCC 1, Constitution Bench of this Court held that while considering an application for grant of pre-arrest bail the Court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation, or tampering with evidence or likelihood of fleeing justice. The Court held:-

“92.4. Courts ought to be generally guided by considerations such as the nature and gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the applicant, and the facts of the case, while considering whether to grant anticipatory bail, or refuse it. Whether to grant or not is a

matter of discretion; equally whether and if so, what kind of special conditions are to be imposed (or not imposed) are dependent on facts of the case, and subject to the discretion of the court.”

7. As per the case put forth in the FIR in question, indubitably, present FIR is for offence u/s 118(1) BNS. The said Offence is attributed to the petitioner for causing it with a sharp-edged Iron Axe. The petitioner has inflicted injury with Iron Axe blow on person of Complainant Dharamvir Singh and his brother Karamvir Singh. As per the MLR report, four other FIRs are pending against the petitioner and he is stated to be on bail in the abovesaid cases. Registration of the present FIR indicates that he has also breached the terms of said bail orders vide which he was released on bail in earlier cases. The petitioner is a man with criminal antecedents. Similarly, the prosecution case cannot be doubted merely because the police did not register an FIR on the complaint made by petitioner's side. There is a strong *prima facie* case against the petitioner in present case, as he has been specifically named in the complaint. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to show that a false case is registered against the petitioner.

No cause *nay* plausible cause has been shown, at this stage, from which it can be deciphered that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the present FIR. It goes without saying that in the instant case, the complainant has categorically stated that the petitioner along with co-accused and as part of an unlawful assembly, acted in furtherance of their common object to inflict multiple injuries upon the complainant party.

8. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to

reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It is imperative that every person in the Society can expect an atmosphere free from foreboding & fear of any transgression. At this stage, there is no material on record to hold that *prima facie* case is not made out against the petitioner. The material which has come on record and preliminary investigation, appear to establish a reasonable basis for the accusations. Thus, it is not appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as it would necessarily cause impediment in effective investigation. In ***State v. Anil Sharma [State v. Anil Sharma, (1997) 7 SCC 187 : 1997 SCC (Cri) 1039]***, the Supreme Court held as under : (SCC p. 189, para 6)

“6. We find force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third-degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

8.1. In view of the gravity of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, the serious nature of injuries sustained by brother of complainant, and the necessity of custodial interrogation for a fair and thorough investigation, this Court is of the considered opinion that the

petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for an effective investigation & to unravel the truth. The petition is, thus, devoid of merits and is hereby dismissed.

- 9. Nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.
- 10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

August 18, 2025
Naveen

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