

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

2026.PHHC.034962



105

**CRM-M-12389-2026**

Parmjeet Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

**Decided on : 07.03.2026**

**Date of uploading: 07.03.2026**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Senior Advocate with

Mr. Utkrant Mahajan, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest/anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.289 dated 24.09.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 109, 3(5), 351(3) of BNS 2023 and Sections 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Civil Lines, Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question reflects that the present FIR was registered at the instance of the complainant, Rajinder Singh, who alleged that in the year 2003 he had advanced a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- to the petitioner (herein) for his domestic needs. Despite repeated demands, the said amount was not returned. On the date of incident i.e. 22.09.2025, the complainant, along with his wife Rajwant Kaur, one Raj Kaur, and driver Vicky, went to the house of petitioner (herein) at village Gokhuwal to

1 demand the repayment of the said amount. It has further been alleged that

upon their arrival at the residence of petitioner, the petitioner and his wife started abusing and threatening them. During the course of the altercation, the wife of the petitioner allegedly brought a .315 bore rifle and handed it over to the petitioner, who allegedly fired 2–3 shots at the complainant with an intention to kill him, which struck the calf portion of his right leg. The complainant was immediately taken to Civil Hospital, and thereafter referred to Guru Nanak Dev Hospital, Amritsar, and subsequently admitted to Amandeep Hospital, Amritsar, where due to severe fracture, his right leg below the calf had to be amputated during treatment. It is further alleged that the incident was recorded on video by Raj Kaur and the complainant's wife. Upon these set of allegations, the present FIR came to be registered against the accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an innocent person and has been falsely implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the complainant are earlier known to each other. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has further contended that on the date of alleged incident, the complainant alongwith 10 other persons barged into the house of the petitioner and raised illegal and unlawful demands, so as to extort money from them. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, while facing an imminent threat to his life as well as to the life of his wife, initially fired a shot in the air from his licensed rifle in order to ward off the complainant and the other persons accompanying him. However, the complainant and the persons accompanying him paid no heed to the said act and continued to harass and assault the petitioner and his wife. It is further submitted that during the course of alleged scuffle, the petitioner, in order to save himself, fired a shot towards the floor near the feet of the complainant,

but the same inadvertently struck the complainant on his foot. It is also contended that on 27.09.2025, the petitioner sent an e-mail to the DIG, Amritsar, apprising him of the true facts and circumstances of the alleged occurrence. Along with the said e-mail, the petitioner had also annexed certain relevant documents including photographs of the alleged incident and a copy of his arms licence, however, no action has been taken thereupon till date. It is contended that the prosecution version is highly doubtful and the case is based upon a concocted story. It is further argued that the investigation has also revealed that no shot was fired with an intention to kill any person. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has further argued that the petitioner fired a shot in the air solely in self-defence, inasmuch as he was allegedly surrounded by the complainant and his family members, who had encircled him with an intention to cause injuries. Learned counsel asserts that in the instant case, the FIR fails to include material facts, which further raised questions about its credibility and fairness. Moreover, the custodial interrogation should not be used as a punitive measure and is justified only when absolutely necessary for the recovery of material evidence. Furthermore, the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and hence no useful purpose would be served by sending him behind the bars. It is lastly submitted by the learned counsel that the present petition be allowed and the petitioner be granted the concession of the anticipatory bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as also learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant have vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by contending that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. It is further submitted that there are specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner to the effect that he fired at the complainant with an intention to

kill him and one bullet hit on the lower leg of the complainant. As per the MLR the injuries sustained by the complainant have been declared to be dangerous to the life. It is further contended that the petitioner also fired his pistol in the open air during the time of said incident. Learned State counsel has iterated that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is imperative for the purpose of effective and fair investigation and to unearth the case of the prosecution. According to learned State counsel, in case the petitioner is granted the concession of pre-arrest, at this stage, it may impede the ongoing investigation.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available record of the case.
6. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court titled as ***Kishor Vishwasrao Patil vs. Deepak Yashwant Patil and another*** passed in ***SLP(Crl) No.1125-2022***, relevant whereof reads as under:

*“74. Ordinarily, arrest is a part of the process of the investigation intended to secure several purposes. There may be circumstances in which the accused may provide information leading to discovery of material facts and relevant information. Grant of anticipatory bail may hamper the investigation. Pre-arrest bail is to strike a balance between the individual's right to personal freedom and the right of the investigating agency to interrogate the accused as to the material so far collected and to collect more information which may lead to recovery of relevant information.*

|     |     |     |     |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| xxx | xxx | xxx | xxx |
| xxx | xxx | xxx | xxx |

*75. Observing that the arrest is a part of the investigation intended to secure several purposes, in ***Adri Dharan Das v. State of W.B. [Adri Dharan Das v. State of W.B., (2005) 4 SCC 303 : 2005 SCC (Cri) 933]*** , it was held as under : (SCC p. 313, para 19)*

*“19. Ordinarily, arrest is a part of the process of investigation intended to secure several purposes. The accused may have to be questioned in detail regarding various facets of motive, preparation, commission and*

*aftermath of the crime and the connection of other persons, if any, in the crime. There may be circumstances in which the accused may provide information leading to discovery of material facts. It may be necessary to curtail his freedom in order to enable the investigation to proceed without hindrance and to protect witnesses and persons connected with the victim of the crime, to prevent his disappearance, to maintain law and order in the locality. For these or other reasons, arrest may become an inevitable part of the process of investigation. The legality of the proposed arrest cannot be gone into in an application under Section 438 of the Code. The role of the investigator is well defined and the jurisdictional scope of interference by the court in the process of investigation is limited. The court ordinarily will not interfere with the investigation of a crime or with the arrest of the accused in a cognizable offence. An interim order restraining arrest, if passed while dealing with an application under Section 438 of the Code will amount to interference in the investigation, which cannot, at any rate, be done under Section 438 of the Code.”*

76. In ***Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra*** [***Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, (2011) 1 SCC 694 : (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 514***], the Supreme Court laid down the factors and parameters to be considered while dealing with anticipatory bail. It was held that the nature and the gravity of the accusation and the exact role of the accused must be properly comprehended before arrest is made and that the court must evaluate the available material against the accused very carefully. It was also held that the court should also consider whether the accusations have been made only with the object of injuring or humiliating the applicant by arresting him or her.

77. After referring to ***Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre*** [***Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, (2011) 1 SCC 694 : (2011) 1 SCC (Cri) 514***] and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in ***Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar*** [***Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar, (2012) 4 SCC 379 : (2012) 2 SCC (Cri) 468***], the Supreme Court held as under : (SCC p. 386, para 19)

“19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroled in the crime and would not misuse his liberty. (See ***D.K. Ganesh Babu v. P.T. Manokaran*** [***D.K. Ganesh Babu v. P.T. Manokaran, (2007) 4 SCC 434 : (2007) 2 SCC (Cri) 345***], ***State of Maharashtra v. Mohd. Sajid Husain Mohd. S. Husain*** [***State of***

*Maharashtra v. Mohd. Sajid Husain Mohd. S. Husain, (2008) 1 SCC 213 : (2008) 1 SCC (Cri) 176] and Union of India v. Padam Narain Aggarwal [Union of India v. Padam Narain Aggarwal, (2008) 13 SCC 305 : (2009) 1 SCC (Cri) 1].)*”

*Economic offences*

78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain [Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain, (1998) 2 SCC 105 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 510], it was held that in economic offences, the accused is not entitled to anticipatory bail.”

15. In Sushila Agrawal and others v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Another reported in (2020) 5 SCC 1, Constitution Bench of this Court held that while considering an application for grant of pre-arrest bail the Court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation, or tampering with evidence or likelihood of fleeing justice. The Court held:-

“92.4. Courts ought to be generally guided by considerations such as the nature and gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the applicant, and the facts of the case, while considering whether to grant anticipatory bail, or refuse it. Whether to grant or not is a matter of discretion; equally whether and if so, what kind of special conditions are to be imposed (or not imposed) are dependent on facts of the case, and subject to the discretion of the court.”

7. As per the allegations put forth in the FIR, serious allegations have undeniably been levelled against the present petitioner. The FIR has been registered against the petitioner and his co-accused on the basis of specific and categorical allegations, wherein the complainant has alleged that the petitioner and his co-accused had trespassed into his house and fired at him with an intention to kill him. As per the version put forth by the petitioner himself, he had fired in the open air, but one of the bullets hit the lower leg of the complainant. As per the MLR the injuries sustained by the complainant on his lower leg have been declared to be dangerous to the life.

As per submissions made by learned State counsel, the investigation is still

at a preliminary stage, and custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is necessary to unravel the truth. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the case registered against the petitioner is false.

No cause *nay* plausible cause has been shown, at this stage, from which it can be deciphered that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the present FIR.

8. 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 is imperative that every person in the Society can expect an atmosphere free from foreboding & fear of any transgression. At this stage, there is no material on record to hold that *prima facie* case is not made out against the petitioner. The material which has come on record and preliminary investigation, appear to be established a reasonable basis for the accusations. Thus, it is not appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as it would necessarily cause impediment in effective investigation. In ***State v. Anil Sharma*** [***State v. Anil Sharma, (1997) 7 SCC 187 : 1997 SCC (Cri) 1039***], the Supreme Court held as under : (SCC p. 189, para 6)

*“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 informations 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.”*

9. In view of the gravity of the allegations and nature of offence, since the necessity of custodial interrogation would arise for a fair and thorough investigation, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for an effective investigation & to unravel the truth. The petition is, thus, devoid of merits and is hereby **dismissed**.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)  
JUDGE

March 07, 2026  
Naveen

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