



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

107

CRM-M-14982-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 19.03.2026

Varun ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Brijesh Nandan, Advocate with
Mr. Aditya Vinayak Bhanot, 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.199 dated 20.12.2025, registered under Sections 109, 125, 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act at Police Station Urban Estate, Patiala, Punjab.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no connection with the alleged offence. It is contended that the petitioner is merely a tabla player associated with Shally Mahant, and that a civil dispute concerning property is pending between Shally Mahant and the complainant. It is further submitted that an earlier FIR lodged by the complainant resulted in the petitioner being granted the concession of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.



Accordingly, a prayer has been made for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that during the incident in question, gunshots were fired upon the complainant, and a bullet was recovered from the window of the car in which the complainant was travelling. It is further submitted that, after recording the statements of two independent witnesses, who are not related to either party, the present petitioner has been nominated in the present case. It is also contended that there exists a dispute between the parties regarding property and both parties belong to transgender community. It is further submitted that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation for the purpose of collecting evidence for the successful prosecution of the case and for effecting recovery of the weapon allegedly used in the commission of the offence.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the allegation against the petitioner is serious in nature that he fired gunshots at the complainant, which struck his car, and a bullet was also recovered from the vehicle; there are eye-witnesses who have deposed regarding the complicity of the present petitioner; that a dispute is ongoing between two groups of transgender persons regarding property as contended by learned State counsel, and considering that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is



CRM-M-14982-2026 (O&M) (3)

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.

19.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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