

209-5
CRM-M-12479-2026

-1-



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12479-2026
Date of decision: 05.05.2026

JASBIR SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Sidhant Vermani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, DAG Punjab.

Mr. P.B.S. Goraya, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in cross-version GD No.46 dated 13.11.2025 (Annexure P-2) registered under Sections 109, 125, 333, 305, 118(1), 191(3), 190 BNS read with Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act in main case registered vide FIR No.260 dated 21.10.2025 registered under Sections 103, 125, 118(1), 191(3) & 190 BNS, 2023 read with Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that in fact, it is a case of version and cross-version wherein one Hari Singh (deceased) along with petitioner and his other relatives were mercilessly attacked as a

result of which Hari Singh lost his life. He has further argued that the



present petitioner is in fact the complainant in the main FIR. He further submits that the opposite party are influential people and are using every possible way to pressurize the petitioner to compromise the matter. However, since the petitioner did not bow down, the opposite party got registered the present cross-version GD. He further submits that initially GD No.45 was registered by the officer concerned with the remarks that GD seems suspicious and requires verification, however, another GD bearing No.46 was registered on the same day against the petitioners thereby casting doubt on the prosecution story. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail. He submits that vide order dated 15.07.2025 passed in *CRM-M-36961-2025* by Co-ordinate Bench, the present petitioner was granted bail in some other FIR, and the petitioner while on bail has committed the offence in question, which clearly reflects that he is a habitual offender. He submits that the role attributed to the petitioner is that he fired a gunshot towards one Ranjit Singh with an intention to kill him, which hit on his right arm. He further submits that the weapon used in the alleged occurrence is yet to be recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that there also exists a reasonable apprehension that, if granted the concession of anticipatory bail, the petitioner may influence witnesses or hamper the course of investigation. Thus, learned State counsel prays that custodial interrogation of petitioner is required for



effective investigation and on these grounds, the learned State counsel has prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant adopts the submissions made by learned State counsel and has opposed to the relief sought by the petitioner.

5. Heard.

6. The allegations levelled against the petitioner is of serious nature. The petitioner was already on bail in another case and while on bail he has committed the present offence, indicating habitual criminal conduct. The petitioner is specifically attributed the role of firing a gunshot at Ranjit Singh with intent to kill, causing injury to his right arm. The weapon allegedly used in the occurrence is also yet to be recovered. The investigation is at a crucial stage, and custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be necessary to unearth the full conspiracy and the involvement of other co-accused. There also exists a reasonable apprehension that, if granted the concession of anticipatory bail, the petitioner may influence witnesses or hamper the course of investigation. The investigation conducted so far points toward requirement of deeper probe. While considering the plea for grant of anticipatory bail, this Court is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusations against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection to the petitioner, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of



7. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma', (1997) 7 SCC 187**, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a 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 offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

8. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied,



it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

9. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

05.05.2026
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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