



212

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16680-2026
Decided on : 04.05.2026

Shivampreet Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Manpreet Ghuman, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Shivampreet Singh, aged 21 years	62	04.02.2026	S. 25 of Arms Act, 1959 and S. 109(1), 3(5) of BNS, 2023	Sector 32-33, Karnal	Karnal

2. In the present case, on 27.03.2026, following order was passed
by this Court:-

“2. Allegations in the FIR read as under:

“ I, Seema W/O Shri Balkar Lathar, am resident of village Phusgarh. My mother-in-law and I live alone at home. The shop below the house has been rented out and we live upstairs. At night, around 12-1 AM, we heard the noise of firing. When my mother-in-law, Rajpati, came out and looked, she saw two unknown men standing outside. When she saw them, they fired a shot again and after seeing her they left. At first, we thought someone had burst firecrackers. When we saw in the morning, the glass of our shop and the balcony above was broken due to bullets. Four bullet shells were found lying in front of the shop and inside the shop. Someone attacked our house with the intention of killing us. I request you to take strict action against



these unknown persons. Thank you, Sd/- Seema Applicant Seema W/O Balkar Singh Mob. 7988539980. It is presently entered that I, INSP/SHO Satish Kumar, am present at the police station that a written application has been submitted by Seema wife of Balkar Lathar, resident of Phusgarh village, against the accused, whose name and address are unknown, regarding firing of bullets at the house of the complainant with the intention to kill, on the basis of which from the application, the offence under Section 109, 3(5) BNS 25-54-59 ARMS ACT was found and hence, case FIR No.62 dated 04.02.2026, Section 109 BNS 25-54-59 ARMS ACT Police Station Sector 32-33 Karnal has been registered and the original application along with the copy of the police file is being handed over to ASI Jagdev for action.”

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that a false story has been concocted against the petitioner, whose name has surfaced only in the disclosure statement of one Jajbir Singh. It is submitted that had there been any truth in the allegations, complainant would have suspected the petitioner at the relevant time, when she allegedly heard noise of bursting crackers or firing of shots, or would have even identified the petitioner.*

4. *It is further contended that merely on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused, which is inadmissible in law, the petitioner cannot be termed as an accused. Moreover, petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation if he is protected from arrest.*

Accordingly, learned counsel prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. *Notice of Motion.*

On advance notice, Mr. Parveen Kumar, Addl. A.G., Haryana, appeared on behalf of the respondent – State.

Learned State counsel submitted that, as per the allegations in the FIR, co-accused Jajbir Singh had procured the weapon used in the crime from one Harman @ Harry, and it was the petitioner who had allegedly taken the said weapon from Jajbir and then fired it in front of the house of the complainant.

However, it is not in dispute that no one suffered any injury, nor is there any allegation of demand of ransom from the complainant.

6. *Adjourned to 04.05.2026.*

7. *In the meanwhile, petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, petitioner shall be released on interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. Petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*



8. *Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 27.03.2026, passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 27.03.2026, passed by this Court is hereby made **absolute**.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. Accordingly, petition stands **disposed of**, accordingly.

8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he



would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 04, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No