



CRM-M-66667-2025 (O&M) -1-

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

106

**CRM-M-66667-2025
Decided on: 28.11.2025**

BUTA SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, 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.62 dated 21.07.2025, under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 351(2), 324(4), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Maloud, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana.

2. The allegations against the present petitioner are that on 18.07.2025, the complainant-Kanwalpreet Singh along with Hardeep Singh went to meet his village friend Nirmal Singh @ Saini at his house in their Car make Swift. Since the car could not enter the street of his friend's house, they parked their Car in the street in front of his house and stayed sitting inside the Car. Meanwhile, Nirmal Singh Saini came and



the complainant asked him to bring water. While Nirmal Singh Saini was away, at about 9:30 P.M, co-accused namely, Jenu, armed with a *kirpan*, Buta Singh (the present petitioner) armed with a *kirpan*, co-accused(s) namely, Simran Singh armed with a *kirpan*, Manpreet Singh armed with an iron rod, Jarnail Singh armed with a *kirpan*, Manjot Singh along with two unidentified young boys, suddenly attacked them while they were sitting in the Car. Co-accused-Jenu struck on his right arm, the present petitioner-Buta also struck on his right arm & co-accused Jarnail Singh struck on his left arm with their respective weapons, cutting the blood vein in his right arm, causing a fracture. Thereafter, they also caused extensive damage to his Car with their weapons and broke all the four glasses of the Car. However, the complainant-party managed to drive the Car away from the spot. While on way to the Civil Hospital Ludhiana for treatment accompanied by his paternal aunt's son, Jaskeerat Singh, near Model Town Colony, Kupp Kalan Road, at about 11:30 to 12:00 at midnight, co-accused-Jenu, along with two unidentified young men, came near their Car on a motorcycle. Jenu fired at them with a revolver, which hit the glass of their Car. However, they sped away in their Car. The co-accused chased them for quite a distance but could not catch them. As such, the present petitioner-Buta Singh alongwith other co-accused, in collusion, had tried to kill the complainant-party.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as in the month



CRM-M-66667-2025 (O&M) -3-

of March, 2025, the complainant had inflicted injuries on the person of the petitioner and his uncle with a sharp edged weapon. It is also contended that there is a delay of 03 days in lodging the FIR. He also contended that the co-accused namely Simran Singh & Manjot Singh have already been granted interim bail vide order dated 26.09.2025 & 16.10.2025, respectively, passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-54762-2025 & CRM-M-58241-2025 (Annexure P-3).

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, on advance notice, has put in appearance and has opposed the prayer made on behalf of the petitioner on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as the weapon used in the alleged offence is yet to be recovered.

5. Heard and paper book perused.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances; allegations against the petitioner are that the petitioner allegedly armed with a *kirpan* has caused injuries on the right arm of the complainant-Kawalpreet Singh; the petitioner alongwith other co-accused has caused damage to the car of the complainant; also the petitioner and the other co-accused in collusion, have tried to kill the complainant; custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as the weapon used in the alleged offence is yet to be recovered from the present petitioner and in case titled as '**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806**' decided on 03.08.1997, it has been held as under:-



“....custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under Section 438 of the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information 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 would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

7. In view of above and considering the allegations being serious in nature, the present petitioner is not entitled for bail and the same is hereby dismissed.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

28.11.2025
Sonia Puri

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