



CRM-M-19560-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

108

**CRM-M-19560-2026
Decided on: 09.04.2026**

RAMANDEEP SINGH**.....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Puneet Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.53 dated 28.02.2026, under Sections 332(C), 115(2), 3(5), 324(2) of BNS, 2023 (Section 117(2) of BNS added vide GD No. 11 dated 29-03-2026 and vide GD no.49 dated 28-02-2026 offence under Section 333, 191(3), 190 BNS enhanced and offence under section 332 (C) and 3(5)BNS deleted) registered at Police Station City Sri Muktsar Sahib, Sri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab. (Annexure P-1).

2. Briefly stated, the present case has been registered on the complaint of Amritpal Singh that he along with Shaminder Singh work as an Insurance Agent. On 21.02.2026, the complainant went to his office where Ramandeep Singh (the present petitioner) along with some unidentified persons entered the same. On being asked for the purpose of their visit by the complainant, the petitioner broke the furniture in the



office and abused him. When the complainant tried to stop the petitioner from doing so, the petitioner along with his companions slapped him. Thereafter, the petitioner picked the envelope containing Rs.1 lakh lying on the table, on which, the complainant asked him to return the same leading to a scuffle that moved outside office building. When the complainant tried to get the money, the petitioner and his companions took out an iron rod and baseball bat from the car parked outside and the present petitioner gave three blows of iron rod, which hit on his forehead, left side of his head and the left side of the back of his head whereas the accomplices of the petitioner also gave baseball bat blows to him, which hit on his left ring finger and left arm. On raising alarms by the complainant and his uncle's son Manpreet Singh, the accused fled away from the spot with their respective weapons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case; there is a delay of 07 days in registration of the present FIR; the injuries in the present case are simple in nature; the offences alleged in the present FIR, are triable by the Magistrate; the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and as such, prayed for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposes the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner while submitting that during the alleged occurrence, the present



petitioner was armed with an iron rod and inflicted three injuries to the complainant out of which, one injury is caused on the head of the complainant which is declared grievous in nature; the petitioner entered into the office of the complainant and caused injuries to him and snatched money from him; as such custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in the present matter to recover snatched money and to recover the weapon used in the alleged offence. Hence, prays for dismissal of the present petition seeking anticipatory bail.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts & circumstances of the present case, the contentions of learned counsel for the parties and the role attributed to the present petitioner that during the alleged occurrence, the petitioner was armed with an iron rod and inflicted three injuries upon the complainant, out of which, one injury is on the vital part i.e. the head of the complainant which is declared grievous in nature; as such the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature; custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to recover the snatched amount as well as to recover the weapon used during the commission of alleged offences.

8. In *State Represented by the C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than



CRM-M-19560-2026 (O&M) -4-

a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. In view of above, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same is hereby **dismissed**.

10. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

09.04.2026*Sonia Puri*

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO

Whether Reportable: YES/NO