



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

110

CRM-M-15784-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 23.03.2026

Ranjit Singh ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Advocate with
Ms. Mallika, Advocate,
Mr. Aryan Sharma, Advocate and
Ms. Simran Kang, 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.197 dated 22.08.2025, registered under Sections 109, 351(3), 191(3), 190, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 & 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar.
2. Briefly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Kulbir Singh that on 21.08.2025, at about 09:15 p.m., when he was sitting in his house alongwith Gurlabh Singh and Manroop Singh, when Ranjit Singh @ Rana called him on his mobile phone and asked him to come outside, stating that he would deal with the complainant. When the complainant alongwith Gurlabh Singh and Manroop Singh went outside the house, he saw Ranjit Singh @ Rana armed with 12 bore rifle, Gurlal Singh armed with 315 bore rifle, Jobanpreet Singh armed with 30 bore pistol and Abhijot Singh @ Abhi armed with 45 bore pistol and 4-5 other unknown persons were already standing there. On seeing them, Gurlal Singh raised



CRM-M-15784-2026 (O&M)

(2)

lalkara and fired a shot with his 315 bore rifle, which hit on the right bicep and chest of Manroop Singh and thus, he fell down on the street. On raising alarm, they all ran away from the spot alongwith their respective weapons by firing in the air and threatening them. It was alleged that the motive behind the occurrence was a previous enmity with Gurjant Singh and others, which was later on compromised. However, being aggrieved by the said compromise, the accused persons allegedly attacked them. Thus, a request for registration of the FIR was made.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. No specific role has been attributed to the present petitioner and weapon allegedly carried by him was a planted one. This is a case of version and cross version and it was the complainant party which attacked the petitioner and other co-accused on the date of occurrence. He further submitted that the petitioner's side sustained multiple injuries, and a DDR dated 26.08.2025 has already been registered on their behalf. He further submits that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case at later stage i.e. after 1½ months on the basis of false and concocted story made by Manroop Singh. He further submitted that as alleged in the FIR, the petitioner was armed with 12 bore rifle, however, no injury has been attributed to him. It is further submitted that co-accused Arandeep Singh, has been granted concession of interim bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 22.01.2026 passed in CRM-M-3520-2026. It is further 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.



4. Notice of motion.

5. 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 the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, as he, along with other co-accused formed an unlawful assembly and accused acted in furtherance of common intention and , allegedly inflicted serious injuries upon the complainant and his friend Manroop Singh while armed with deadly weapons. He further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the weapons used in the commission of the offence. Accordingly, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

6. Mr. N.K. Banka, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed memorandum of appearance, which is taken on record. Learned counsel also opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the CCTV footage of the incident clearly shows that the petitioner was firing gunshots. Learned counsel placed reliance upon order dated 12.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-8110-2026, wherein anticipatory bail petition of two co-accused has been dismissed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Thus, learned counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

7. Heard.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, allegation against the present petitioner are serious in nature that he along with other co-



CRM-M-15784-2026 (O&M) (4)

accused, allegedly fired gunshots at Manroop Singh with the intention to kill him, who received gunshot injury. Present petitioner actively participated in the commission of offence and armed with a gun. Allegation is supported by electronic evidence i.e. CCTV footage. In the light of aforesaid discussion, 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, hence, 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.

9. Hon’ble Apex Court in *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, has 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.

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

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

23.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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