



CRM-M-58189-2025 (O&M) -1-

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

215

**CRM-M-58189-2025
Decided on: 09.12.2025**

TARANDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Ms. Riffi Birla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.80 dated 24.08.2025, under Sections 103, 109, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Daresi Ludhiana.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the instant FIR was registered on the statement of complainant namely, Kranti that on 23.08.2025 at about 10:45 PM, when he was present at his home, he received a call to the fact that his son namely, Kartik had been shot by someone at ICICI Bank Chowk, Sundar Nagar, Ludhiana. Thereafter, he reached the spot with his colleagues and found that another boy namely, Mohan had also been shot. Upon arranging a vehicle, he took his son to



CMC Hospital, where the doctors declared his son dead. It is further alleged that his son-Kartik (since deceased) often used to tell the complainant that Shubham Mota, Gagan Gill and Tony could kill him any time.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not been named in the present FIR as he was named later on.

4. Learned counsel for the State contended that as per the CCTV footage recovered during investigation, the present petitioner was present on the spot when the alleged incident occurred. It is further contended that he has passed on the weapon used in the alleged offence to someone else and whereabouts of the weapon used in the said offence is known to the present petitioner and as such, he is required for custodial interrogation to know the true facts of the present case and for recovery of the weapon.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts of the present case and as per case of prosecution, there is a CCTV footage showing the petitioner to be present at the spot of occurrence where the son of the complainant was allegedly shot; the petitioner is alleged to have passed on the weapon used in the offence; whereabouts of the weapon used are known to petitioner; the allegations against the present petitioner suggest his direct involvement in the offence; as such, the present petitioner is required for custodial interrogation so as to collect the material evidence in the



CRM-M-58189-2025 (O&M) -3-

present case and for recovery of the weapon used in the offence; in State represented by the *C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

7. In view of above, the present petitioner deserves no leniency in the present case and is not entitled for discretionary relief as prayed for. Therefore, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

09.12.2025
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO