

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48097-2025
Reserved on: 01.10.2025
Pronounced on: 31.10.2025

Mangal Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. J.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Sachin Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Rakhi Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
38	15.05.2025	Arif Ke, District Ferozepur	109, 3(5) BNS and 25, 27 of Arms Act (Section 103 BNS added later on vide DDR No.27)

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Per paragraph 13(H) of the status report, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“4. That the brief facts of the case are that present FIR No.38 dated 15.05.2025 U/s 109,3(5) of BNS, 2023 and 25/27 Arms Act and offence u/s 103 BNS added later on vide DDR no.27 dated 03.08.2025, Police Station Arif Ke. District Ferozepur has been registered on the statement of Jugraj Singh son of Davinder Singh, resident of village Kamala Middu, District Ferozepur against 1)Jagjit Singh son of Dalwinder Singh, 2)Akashdeep Singh son of Gurmeet Singh, 3)Mangal Singh son of Sahib Singh (present petitioner) and 4)unknown person, on the allegations that Prabhjot Kaur, sister of the complainant is married to Jagjit Singh son of Dalwinder Singh accused, resident of village Bagge Wala for the last 8/10 years. She was being harassed

and given beatings by her husband Jagjit Singh, her father-in-law Dalwinder Singh and her mother-in-law Manjit Kaur, due to which the complainant and his father Davinder Singh had gone to their house at village Bagge Wala, to conciliate them. On 14.05.2025, the complainant and his cousin Balwinder Singh son of Jagtar Singh had gone to Village Baggu Wala to watch Kabbadi tournament. At about 6:45 PM, Jagjit Singh accused armed with revolver, Akashdeep Singh, Mangal Singh (present petitioner) and one unknown person came there. Akashdeep Singh raised lalkara to teach a lesson to the complainant for making complaint of Jagjit Singh, upon which Jagjit Singh fired shots from his revolver towards the complainant, which hit on the left side of the neck, in the stomach, on the left side of the right thigh and on the back side of the right shoulder of complainant. Complainant fell on the ground, upon which, his cousin Balwinder Singh raised alarm and then all the assailants fled away from the spot alongwith their weapons on their motor cycles. Then, Davinder Singh father of complainant came at the spot, who got admitted the complainant at Baghi Hospital, Ferozepur. As per complainant, the motive behind the occurrence is that Jagjit Singh and others used to harass Prabhjot Kaur, sister of complainant and the complainant had gone to their house for complaining and making them understand, due to which Jagjit Singh has fired upon complainant with intention to kill him. Thus initially case u/s 109,3(5) BNS and 25/27/54/59 Arms Act has been registered against Akashdeep Singh, Jagjit Singh, Mangal Singh present petitioner and one unknown person.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family. Counsel for the petitioner submits that initially offence under Section 103 BNS was not there and he was granted the benefit of interim bail by Sessions Court and after addition of offence under Section 103 BNS, petitioner came up before this Court for anticipatory bail.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the status report.

7. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which read as follows:

“F. The role of the petitioner.

The petitioner was duly named in the FIR by the complainant and he accompanied the other assailants, from whom one of the assailants committed murder of the complainant.”

8. Allegations against the petitioner are only that he was member of unlawful assembly which has committed the murder of Jugraj Singh and no weapon has been attributed to the petitioner.

9. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage, but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.

10. The law of bail, like any other branch of law, has its own philosophy, and occupies an important place in the administration of justice and the concept of bail emerges from the conflict between the police power to restrict liberty of a man who is alleged to have committed a crime, and presumption of innocence in favour of the alleged criminal.¹ Personal liberty is a very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.² Personal liberty deprived when bail is refused, is too precious a value of our constitutional system recognised under Art. 21 that the curial power to negate it is a great trust exercisable, not casually, but judicially with lively concern for the cost to the individual and the community.³

11. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

12. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

13. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

14. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

¹ Supreme Court of India in Vaman Narain Ghiya v. state of Rajasthan, [E-SCR] ; [2008] 17 SCR 369, Para 16, decided on 12.12.2008.

² Supreme Court of India in Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, SC 2J [E-SCR], Paragraph 127, decided on 02.12.2010.

³ Supreme Court of India in *Babu Singh & ors v. State of UP*, [E-SCR] P. 777, decided on 31.01.1978.

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

15. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

16. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall not enter the property, workplace, and residence of the victim until the statements of all non-official and informal witnesses in the trial are recorded. This Court is imposing this condition to rule out any attempt by the accused to incapacitate, influence, or cause any discomfort to the victim. Reference be made to *Vikram Singh v Central Bureau of Investigation*, 2018 All SCR (Crl.) 458; and *Aparna Bhatt v. The State of Madhya Pradesh*, 2021:INSC:192, 2021 SCC Online SC 230.

17. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the victim, members of society, and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of the uploading of this order on the official webpage of this Court and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

18. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT*

of Delhi, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court holds that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

19. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

20. It is clarified that if the petitioner violates any bail condition, the State and/or the victim may file an application for bail cancellation before the trial court, which shall be competent to cancel the bail or add more conditions. Furthermore, if the petitioner moves for deletion or dilution of any bail conditions, the trial court is empowered to do so.

21. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

22. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

23. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

24. It is clarified that this bail order shall not be considered as a blanket bail order in any other matter and is only limited to granting bail in the FIR mentioned above.

25. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants

CRM-M-48097-2025

to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

26. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

31.10.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.