



205

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-56920-2024
Date of Decision:-24.01.2025

MANPREET SINGH

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. A.S. Gulati, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

By way of the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) the petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in FIR detailed as under (Annexure P-1):-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
153	12.10.2024	110, 3(5), 61(2), 324(4) of BNS and 25 and 27 of Arms Act.	Pasyana, District Patiala

2. Argument heard.
3. It is, *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that the pistol allegedly used in the occurrence has already been recovered from the co-accused Judgejit Singh alias Judge, as such custodial



interrogation of the petitioner is not required, hence, prayed for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Harbans Singh and referring to the reply submitted by the State has assailed these arguments by submitting that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having fired from his pistol on the complainant and the recovery of weapon is yet to be effected from the petitioner. He submits that the pistol recovered from the co-accused Judgejit Singh @ Judge (supra) has been different qua which FIR No. 46 of 2022, under Section 307 IPC, PS Urban Estate Patiala has been registered. He submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the weapon used in the occurrence, as such prays for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. After considering the arguments and perusing the record, it is observed that the allegations levelled against the petitioner is that he alongwith other accomplice had stopped the truck carrying rice powder on 11.10.2024 by parking their car in the middle of the road. On the truck being stopped the petitioner holding a pistol had fired directly upon the complainant truck driver and the bullet penetrate the glass and struck into the shoulder of the complainant and thereafter, the assailants ran away from the spot.

6. It is evident from the perusal of record that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having fired from his pistol with an intent to kill the complainant and the bullet so fired had hit on the shoulder of the complainant. The recovery of the pistol is yet to be effected from the



petitioner, for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence, no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

7. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

24.01.2025
Gyan

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |