



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-4963 of 2026

Date of Decision: 24.04.2026

Jagjit Singh alias Jagga

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. V.K.Pujara, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for anticipatory bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 02 dated 04.01.2026, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 115(2), 118(1), 351(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190 and 61(2) of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023' Police Station Bilga, District Jalandhar-Rural, Punjab.

2. Vide order dated 29.01.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

3. Heard.

4. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that

in compliance with order dated 29.01.2026, the petitioner has already joined the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 29.01.2026 be made absolute.

5. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. The learned State counsel, on the instructions from ‘ASI Jaswinder Singh’, has contended that when the petitioner was joined in the investigation he did not cooperate, and that to collect evidence further custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. Keeping in view the facts & circumstances of the present case, following are the relevant factors which are supposed to be taken into consideration:-

- i) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation;
- ii) that the petitioner cannot be forced to assist the prosecuting agency for the recovery of incriminating material which may harm his interests or may amount to defeat his right of defence, as laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case of “Vinay Kumar Gupta v. State of Madhya Pradesh” [Criminal Appeal No. 939 of 2026, Decided on 16.02.2026];
- iii) that nothing significant has to be recovered in this case with the assistance of petitioner, to link him with the commission of crime;

- iv) that there is nothing on record to show that while on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses;
- v) that there is nothing on record to show that while on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation; and
- vi) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result.

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid, and the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, it is hereby ordered that the petitioner is entitled for anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is hereby **allowed** and the order dated 29.01.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

April 24, 2026
“DK”

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