



CRM-M-20856-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214/2

CRM-M-20856-2026
Decided on: 07.05.2026

Sukhmander Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of DDR No.23 Dated 14.07.2025, under sections 109, 118(1), 115, 191(3), and 190 Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to sections 307, 324, 323, 148, and 149 IPC, 1860) and Sections 25, 27 Arms Act, 1959, entered in FIR No. 83 Dated 13.07.2025 under sections 109, 118(1), 115, 191(3), 190 BNS, 2023, sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Zira, District Ferozepur.

2. On 18.04.2026, following order was passed:

“(i) xx xx xx xx

(ii) *Learned counsel for the petitioner, contends that petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in a cross-version case. Initially, on the statement of Sukhmander Singh (petitioner herein), FIR No. 83 dated 13.07.2025 was registered under Sections 109, 118(1), 115, 191(3), and 190 of the Bharatiya*



Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, along with Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, against the accused namely (1) Shamsheer Singh, (2) Amritpal Singh, (3) Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, (4) Thamanpreet Singh, (5) Jatinder Singh, and 2–3 unidentified persons.

As per the allegations in the originally registered FIR, it was accused Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi and Shamsheer Singh who fired multiple shots from their pistols, one of which struck Jagsir Singh on his right eyebrow.

(iii) On the following day, DDR No. 23 dated 14.07.2025 was recorded at the instance of complainant Shamsheer Singh (who is an accused in the FIR), against the opposite side, alleging commission of offences under Sections 109, 118(1), 115, 191(3), and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 307, 324, 323, 148, and 149 of the IPC, 1860), along with Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959.

In the said cross-version, in which the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail, complainant-Shamsheer Singh alleged that accused namely Sukhmander Singh (petitioner herein), Amritpal Singh, Kala Singh, Lovepreet Singh, Manpreet Singh, Bohar Singh, and Jagseer Singh arrived at the spot, and that Kala Singh fired a shot from a revolver, which hit the left thigh of the complainant.

(iv) Counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the role attributed to the petitioner, he was allegedly armed with a kappa and had grappled with the complainant.

It is further submitted that FIR No.83 dated 13.07.2025 was initially registered at the instance of the petitioner (Annexure P-2), whereas the present cross-version, in the form of DDR No.23 dated 14.07.2025, has been lodged subsequently after concocting a false version, and is therefore delayed.

It is further argued that there exists admitted political rivalry in the village, which stands recorded in the cross-version itself, thereby indicating the possibility of false implication. Counsel submits that allegations regarding the petitioner's involvement are wholly false, and that no firearm was in fact used by him.

(v) It is also submitted that co-accused Manpreet Singh has already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 02.04.2026, passed in CRM-M-17458-2026 (Annexure P-3), and same is posted for hearing on 07.05.2026.

Additionally, it is submitted that petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and to fully cooperate with the investigating agency, subject to protection from arrest by this Court. Thus, counsel prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

**CRM-M-20856-2026**

(vi) *Notice of motion.*

(vii) *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

(viii) *On being queried by this Court, learned State counsel submits that a reddish abrasion was observed by the doctors on the right arm of the complainant. However, no injury was found on the waist of the injured/victim, Jatinder Singh.*

(ix) *Adjourned to 07.05.2026.*

To be heard along with CRM-M-17458-2026.

(x) *Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

(xi) *Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Learned State counsel on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation, and as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 18.04.2026 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

5. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

6. However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within



CRM-M-20856-2026

a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

7. It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

07.05.2026
reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:	YES/ NO
Whether Reportable:	YES /NO