

2026:PHHC:074289



104

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-22550-2026**

Ranvir Kapoor

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Date of Decision: May 12, 2026**Date of Uploading: May 12, 2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL****Present:** Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG Punjab.

***********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') (erstwhile Section 438 of the Cr. P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case bearing FIR No.36 dated 03.02.2026, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 194(2), 109, 324(4), 333, 351, 191(2) and 190 of the BNS, 2023, and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Sahnewal, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioner is that on the basis of secret information received, it was revealed that on 02.02.2026, at about 7:30 PM, members of both groups, along with their associates, assembled in Street No.1, Mohalla Mahadev Nagar, where they attacked

each other using swords, bricks, baseball bats, and firearms. Both factions opened fire at each other with their respective weapons, during which Lokesh Rawat sustained a gunshot injury to his leg, while several members from both sides suffered injuries caused by bricks, baseball bats, and swords. The rival groups assaulted each other with deadly weapons, extended threats and challenges to one another, and thereafter fled from the spot in their respective vehicles while carrying their weapons. It was further alleged that members of the Mani Khachar gang, along with their accomplices, forcibly entered the premises of Masle's barber shop, namely "Black Room Hair Cutting," and vandalized the same. The activities of both gangs had created such an atmosphere of terror in the locality that no resident was willing to come forward or disclose any information due to fear of retaliation from either group.

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. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner has been implicated at the instance of his brother, namely, Jatinder Kappor and his associates, with whom, there are already civil and criminal litigations pending with respect to the properties left by their father. Learned counsel has contended that the petitioner is running a proprietorship firm under the name and style of 'Kapoor Crockeries' and has no connection or concerned with the occurrence in question. Learned counsel has urged that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and has been implicated only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Raja Kumar @ Sadd @ Rajat, and the said

disclosure is not tenable in law. It has been further urged that there is not even any Call Details Record available, which may suggest complicity of the petitioner in the offence in question or with the co-accused.

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 petitioner. 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 petitioner is ready to join the investigation and, hence, no useful purpose would be served by sending him behind the bars. On the aforesaid submissions, the grant of anticipatory bail is entreated for.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while raising submissions in tandem with the status report by way of an affidavit dated 11.05.2026 (filed in the Court today and is taken on record) has opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. Relevant of the said status report reads as under:

“10. HOW THE PRESENT PETITIONER NOMINATED IN THE PRESENT CASE:

That during the course of investigation, the petitioner-accused came to be nominated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Raja @ Shaid @ Rajat, wherein the involvement and active participation of the petitioner in the occurrence in question was specifically disclosed.

11. ROLE OF THE PETITIONER:

That the role attributed to the petitioner-accused is specific, direct and actives in nature, inasmuch as the petitioner came to be nominated during the course of investigation on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Raja @ Shaid @ Rajat, wherein his involvement in the occurrence in question was specifically disclosed. It has surfaced during investigation that the petitioner was an active member of the aforesaid

rival gang and had participated in the armed confrontation dated 02.02.2026 at Street No. 01, Mohalla Mahadev Nagar, Ludhiana, wherein both the rival groups, armed with illegal firearms, swords, baseball bats, bricks and other deadly weapons, attacked each other with the common object of eliminating and overawing the rival party. The petitioner actively participated in the said violent gang clash, which resulted in firearm injuries, other bodily injuries and disturbance of public peace and tranquility, and his complicity prima facie stands established from the material collected during investigation supra.

12. EVIDENCE AGAINST THE PETITIONER:

That during the course of investigation, the petitioner-accused was nominated on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Raja @ Shaid @ Rajat and his complicity in the occurrence in question is further connected from the prosecution version as unfolded in the FIR, wherein members of both rival groups armed with illegal firearms and deadly weapons had participated in the violent gang clash dated 02.02.2026, resulting in firearm injuries and disturbance of public peace and tranquility.

13. STATUS OF THE TRIAL:

The investigation in the present case is underway, the challan shall be presented before the Ld. Trial Court after completion of the investigation.

14. CRIMINAL ANTECEDENTS OF THE PETITIONER:

That as per police records the present petitioner is involved in following other criminal case/FIR.

- I. FIR No. 127, dated 21.08.2025, under Section 329(3), 305 and 3(5) of BNS,2023, registered at Police Station Haibowal, Ludhiana.*
- II. FIR No. 13, dated 26.10.2026, under Section 333, 115(2), 351(2), 191(3) of 190 BNS and Section 25 of Arms act 1959, registered at Police Station Daba Ludhiana.”*

It has been, thus, argued that given the severity of the offence, there exists a substantial likelihood that the petitioner may abscond or tamper with the evidence, if he is enlarged on bail. Learned State counsel has iterated that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner 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 prosecution case and material available on record, it is borne out that serious allegations have been leveled against the petitioner. It has been further borne out that the petitioner has been specifically nominated during the course of investigation on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused – Raja @ Shaid @ Rajat, wherein his active involvement in the occurrence in question has been categorically disclosed. The investigation has further revealed that the petitioner was an active member of the rival gang and had participated in the violent armed confrontation dated 02.02.2026 at Street No.01, Mohalla Mahadev Nagar, Ludhiana, wherein both rival groups, armed with illegal firearms, swords, baseball bats, bricks and other deadly weapons, attacked each other with the common object of overawing and eliminating the rival faction. The occurrence resulted in firearm injuries, bodily injuries to several persons and disturbance of public peace and tranquility, thereby creating an atmosphere of terror in the locality. The role attributed to the petitioner is specific, direct and active in nature and his complicity *prima facie* stands established from the material collected during investigation.

6.1. Furthermore, the petitioner is also involved in other criminal cases, as reflected from his criminal antecedents, which clearly demonstrates his tendency to indulge in criminal activities.

6.2. The trial Court, while declining anticipatory bail to the petitioner, has observed that the allegations on record *prima facie* reveal that both the rival parties had formed gangs and were creating an atmosphere of terror among the general public. It was further observed that members of both groups had used deadly weapons, including firearms, against each other during the occurrence in question. Learned Trial Court further held that, at

this stage of investigation, the possibility of the applicant's complicity in the commission of the offence could not be ruled out.

7. 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.

8. 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 interest(s). 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, (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.”

9. In view of the seriousness and gravity of allegations and the role attributed to the petitioner, this Court finds no compelling ground to extend the benefit of discretionary relief to the petitioner. Granting bail, at this stage, would not only undermine the administration of justice but may also embolden the accused and pose a threat to the safety and well-being of the victim and other witnesses.

10. In view of above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, the investigation is still underway and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is being sought for effective investigation, recovery of weapons and to unearth the larger conspiracy and involvement of other co-accused persons. The petition is, thus, devoid of merits and is hereby **dismissed**.

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

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

May 12, 2026

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No