



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

112

CRM-M-15935-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 23.03.2026

Jaswinder Singh @ Babba	Versus	... Petitioner
State of Punjab		... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Harmanpreet Singh, 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.126 dated 14.06.2025, registered under Sections 109 and 309(4) of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.
2. 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, which is inadmissible in evidence. Except disclosure statement, there is no other evidence showing complicity of petitioner in commission of alleged offence. Nothing is to be recovered from the present petitioner. 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.
3. Notice of motion.



4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab accepted notice on behalf of the respondent–State opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and that the petitioner along with co-accused snatched a truck from the complainant at gun point; the aforesaid truck was recovered after the arrest of co-accused. The petitioner is having criminal antecedents and he is also involved in 2 other cases of heinous crime i.e. one under Section 302 of IPC and another is under Section 379 of IPC. 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 the recovery of the weapon as he was armed with a pistol at that time. Thus, learned State counsel has prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Heard.

6. 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 is that he along with co-accused snatched the truck from the complainant at gun point; the truck was recovered after arrest of co-accused; the petitioner is involved in two other cases of heinous crime, and considering submission of the learned State counsel 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



CRM-M-15935-2026 (O&M) (3)

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 Supreme 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.

23.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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