



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

Sr. No.108

CRM-M-18884-2026
Date of Decision: 07.04.2026

RAJWINDER SINGH @ PRABHU HALWAI**...Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present:- Mr. Chetan Sharma, Mr. Deepak Girotra,
Mr. Shivendra Swaroop and
Mr. Yaseen Sethi, Advocates for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 Cr.P.C.) seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 59 dated 18.03.2026, registered under Sections 125, 333 and 351(3) of the BNS, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 336, 452 and 506 of IPC) and Sections 25/27/54/59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Jaito, District Faridkot.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the statement of the complainant was recorded on 18.03.2026, wherein it was alleged that the complainant along with others jointly owned a marriage palace namely Dream Castle Palace at Jaito, which had earlier been given on contract to the petitioner. It is alleged that after termination of the agreement and settlement of accounts, the petitioner continued to visit the premises and assert his claim over the same. It is further alleged that on the intervening night of 17/18.03.2026, the



petitioner along with his associate entered the premises of the palace, abused the staff and, in the course of the incident, took a revolver from his associate and fired two shots in the air while extending threats to kill. Thereafter, the petitioner fled from the spot along with his associate and the weapon. The said act is stated to have been captured in the CCTV footage, forming the basis for registration of the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case arising out of a contractual dispute regarding the marriage palace and that the FIR is a result of prior enmity. It is further submitted that there was delay in lodging of the FIR, no injury has been caused to any person, and the alleged weapon was a licensed one belonging to a co-accused. It is thus prayed that the petitioner be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, Mr. J.K. Singla, Advocate, who has filed his memo of appearance, has opposed the present petition on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner fired two consecutive shots during a function which was going on in the marriage palace, thereby disturbing the entire function and bringing disrepute to the establishment of the complainant. It is further contended that the petitioner also threatened to kill the owner of the palace and, thus, the allegations against him are grave in nature and disentitle him from the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for grant of



anticipatory bail is made out. The allegations against the petitioner are serious and pertain to use of a firearm in a public place during a function, thereby creating panic and endangering the safety of persons present. The act attributed to the petitioner reflects a brazen and reckless disregard for law and order. The allegation of firing shots and extending threats to kill cannot be taken lightly, particularly when such conduct has the potential to disturb public peace and create an atmosphere of fear.

6. Considering the gravity and nature of the allegations, the manner in which the offence is stated to have been committed, and the requirement of custodial interrogation for proper investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

8. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

07.04.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No