



CRM-M-8203-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

116

**CRM-M-8203-2026
Decided on: 09.03.2026**

RANJIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Adesh Pal Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate for the complainant.

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.361 dated 23.07.2025, under Sections 118(1), 118(2), 115(2), 333, 324(4), 191(3), 190 of Bharatiya Nayaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 registered at Police Station Sadar Goindwal Sahib, District Tarn Taran.

2. The present FIR was registered on 23.07.2025 on the statement of complainant Amandeep Kaur regarding an occurrence dated 11.07.2025 arising out of a land partition dispute between her father-in-law Paramjit Singh and his brothers, including Ranjit Singh (the present petitioner). It is alleged that despite an oral partition, dispute regarding



cultivation of land was continuing. As per the allegations, on the day of occurrence, Ranjit Singh (the present petitioner), along with co-accused Manjit Singh, Jasbir Singh, Daljit Singh, Kuldeep Singh and two unknown persons, came to the disputed fields while armed with weapons and started ploughing the crop. When the complainant party noticed the same, Ranjit Singh (the present petitioner) allegedly raised a *lalkara*, after which all the accused persons entered the house of the complainant. It is specifically alleged that the present petitioner was armed with a *kirpan* and gave a blow to Paramjit Singh (father-in-law of the complainant), which landed near his left elbow when he tried to ward off the attack.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended the petitioner who is aged about 65 years, has been falsely implicated in the present case; it is a case of version and cross-version and it is a matter of trial to determine as to who was the aggressor party; the petitioner is having clean & clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case. Learned counsel prayed for anticipatory bail as the petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Adesh Pal Singh, AAG, Punjab has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State whereas Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate accepts notice on behalf



of the complainant and opposes the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that there are specific allegations against the present petitioner who is alleged to have raised a *lalkaara* and was allegedly armed with a deadly weapon i.e. *kirpan* thereby, and gave a *kirpan* blow to Paramjit Singh (father-in-law of the complainant) near his left elbow. The allegations are serious in nature and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the weapon allegedly used in the commission of offence and hence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Heard.

8. Keeping in view the facts of the present case and as per case of prosecution that the petitioner was a member of unlawful assembly with a common object to cause injury(s) to the complainant-party and the present petitioner was allegedly armed with a deadly weapon i.e. *kirpan*, and gave a blow to Paramjit Singh (father-in-law of the complainant) near his left elbow; as such the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the alleged weapon used in the commission of offence and for proper investigation, hence, this Court is not inclined in favour of granting extra-ordinary relief of anticipatory bail. 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.

9. In view of above, the present petitioner is not entitled for discretionary relief as prayed for and the present petition is hereby dismissed.

10. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

09.03.2026
Sonia Puri

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