



131

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-16604-2026

Ranjit Singh @ Goldy

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Date of Decision: March 25, 2026**Date of Uploading: March 25, 2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL****Present:** Mr. Inder Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab
(Through V.C.).

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest/anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case bearing FIR No.15 dated 31.01.2026 registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Verowal, District Tarn Taran.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question reflects that it has been registered on the basis of a complaint moved by complainant-Jasbir Kaur, who in her statement made to the police has stated that on 09.01.2026, an application was submitted with the police by her mother namely Mahinder Kaur, wherein allegations were levelled against the petitioner and other

accused persons of having prepared forged wills and documents to illegally transfer and grab the said land. It was alleged that the petitioner, along with others, got the complainant's minor grandson addicted to drugs and, taking advantage of him, got land transferred without paying any consideration. Inquiry regarding the abovesaid allegations was stated to be pending. In her complaint, the complainant has further stated that subsequently, on 30.01.2026 at about 9:00 AM, the petitioner alongwith other accused persons and 30-40 unidentified persons, arrived at the disputed land armed with deadly weapons and started harvesting standing crops of peas and potatoes. When the complainant, along with her mother Mahinder Kaur and her son Atinderbir Singh, objected to the harvesting. Thereafter, the petitioner (herein) allegedly slapped Mahinder Kaur. Then Atinderbir Singh intervened to protect his grandmother, the petitioner, who was armed with a *datar*, allegedly attempted to strike a blow on her head. However, Atinderbir Singh raised his right hand in order to save himself and the said *datar* hit on his right thumb, due to which he right thumb was partially amputated. The complainant has further alleged that the other accused raised *lalkaras* exhorting to kill the old woman. On hearing the same, the complainant and her nephew Kultar Singh came forward to intervene. In the meantime, Gurdial Singh, brother of the petitioner, allegedly slapped the complainant, while Anmol Singh @ Mola inflicted a *datar* blow on Kultar Singh, who raised his left hand in defence and sustained serious injuries to his fingers. Thereafter, upon the complainant side raising alarm, the accused persons fled from the spot along with their weapons and vehicles while extending threats. Upon these set of allegations, the present FIR came to be registered against the accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that a bare perusal of the FIR itself shows that allegations leveled against the petitioner are concocted, improbable and devoid of any merit. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has iterated that the petitioner has no role in the present FIR. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case arising out of a civil dispute regarding agricultural land. He has further contended that it is a case of version and cross-version wherein the petitioner has also suffered injuries in the occurrence.

3.1. Learned counsel asserts that the police have not conducted a fair and impartial investigation and the inquiry conducted so far is not only incomplete, but also tainted with bias. Learned counsel has asserted that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioners. Moreover, the custodial interrogation should not be used as a punitive measure and is justified only when absolutely necessary for the recovery of material evidence. Furthermore, the petitioners are ready to join the investigation and, hence, no useful purpose would be served by sending them behind the bars. On the aforesaid submissions, the grant of anticipatory bail is entreated for.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners by arguing that the offence committed by the petitioners is serious in nature. Learned State counsel has iterated that there are specific and direct allegations against the petitioners of causing a grievous injury with a sharp-edged weapon. He has further submitted that as per MLR (Annexure P-3) the right thumb of the son of the complainant was partially amputated. Given the severity of the offence and no clean antecedents, there exists a substantial likelihood that the petitioners may

abscond or tamper with the evidence, if they are enlarged on bail. Learned State counsel has iterated that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is imperative for the purpose of effective and fair investigation and to unearth the case of the prosecution. On these submissions, dismissal of the present petition is entreated for.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available record of the case.

6. As per the case put forth in the FIR in question, indubitably, grave and serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. As per the version put forth by the prosecution, it prima facie emerges that the petitioner and other accused persons formed unlawful assembly and were armed with deadly weapons such as *datar*, and thereafter attacked upon the complainant-side. The petitioner is alleged to have been armed with a *datar* and is specifically attributed with causing a blow using the said weapon, which struck the right thumb of the complainant's son, resulting in partial amputation of the thumb, which fact has also been proved on record by the MLR (Annexure P-3). Though a cross-version has been recorded, pertaining to same incident, but keeping in view the role attributed to the petitioner, the same does not dilute the specific allegations against the petitioner. Furthermore, the recovery of the weapon of offence is yet to be effected, for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessarily required, at this stage, for a fair and effective investigation.

No cause *nay* plausible cause has been shown, at this stage, from which it can be deciphered that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the present FIR.

7. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding

individual rights and protecting societal interests. The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It is imperative that every person in the Society can expect an atmosphere free from foreboding & fear of any transgression. At this stage, there is no material on record to hold that prima facie case is not made out against the petitioner. The material which has come on record and preliminary investigation, appear to be established a reasonable basis for the accusations. Thus, it is not appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as it would necessarily cause impediment in effective investigation. In *State v. Anil Sharma* [*State v. Anil Sharma, (1997) 7 SCC 187 : 1997 SCC (Cri) 1039*], the Supreme Court held as under : (SCC p. 189, para 6)

“6. We find force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third-degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

8. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, this Court finds no compelling ground to extend the benefit of discretionary relief to the petitioner. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for an effective investigation & to unravel the truth. The petition is, thus, devoid of merits and is hereby **dismissed**.

9. Nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

March 25, 2026
Naveen

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No