



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

151

CRM-M-14235-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 13.03.2026

Harinder Singh Bhullar ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. R.S. Bains, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.276 dated 22.12.2025, registered under Sections 109, 303(2), 324(4), 351(2), 190, 191(3) of BNS and Sections 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act at Police Station Contonment, Amritsar, Punjab.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the matter involves a version and a cross-version. The present FIR has been registered on the basis of false and fabricated story by concealing the true facts and genesis of occurrence. The petitioner was not even present at the spot when the entire incident took place rather the petitioner reached at the spot on receiving the information regarding the incident from his driver Harjinder when he was accused by Sartaj Singh accused in the cross case. However, the petitioner has neither caused any injury to anyone nor the petitioner has used



the pistol rather the petitioner was involved in the said occurrence on the basis of false allegation. It is submitted that in the alleged occurrence the driver of petitioner has also sustained four injuries. The injuries suffered by the complainant are simple in nature. Learned counsel further contended that the petitioner's version was registered after a delay after following the intervention of the High Court. It is also submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation. Accordingly, learned counsel prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate, appeared on behalf of the complainant and filed the power of attorney, which was taken on record. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submitting that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. It is submitted that the petitioner was armed with a .32 bore pistol and fired gunshots indiscriminately, one of which struck the complainant on his leg, as a result of which he was medico-legally examined. It is further submitted that while the complainant was being shifted to the hospital, another gunshot was fired and the car was also damaged by the accused party. It is further submitted that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation for the purpose of collecting evidence for the successful prosecution's case and for the recovery of the weapon allegedly used in the commission of the offence.

5. Heard.



CRM-M-14235-2026 (O&M) (3)

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, particularly the role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the offence, and that he allegedly fired gunshots and one of the shots struck the complainant, and considering that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for effective investigation as well as for the recovery of the weapon allegedly used in the commission of the offence, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for granting the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail. It is well settled that anticipatory bail is an extraordinary relief which is to be granted sparingly and only in exceptional cases where the circumstances justify such concession.

7. Custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is necessary for effecting a proper and in-depth investigation in the case. Hon’ble Apex Court in *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by anticipatory bail, wherein interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

13.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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