

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:074605



102

CRM-M-23543-2026 (O&amp;M)

Date of decision:12.05.2026

Harshdeep Singh @ Harsh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Gaurav Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

...

**Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.367, dated 18.05.2025, registered under Sections 25(1-B) of the Arms Act (offence under Section 29 of the Arms Act added lateron), at Police Station Sadar, Karnal, District Karnal.

2. As per the allegations, on 18.05.2025, on receipt of a secret information to the effect that one Harnoor Singh @ Noor was standing near Karan Lake, Karnal and was having one illicit weapon with him and that he could be apprehended with the same, a raiding party was formed, which reached at the informed place and apprehended accused Harnoor Singh @ Noor. One country-made pistol .32 bore along with two live cartridges was recovered from his conscious possession. He was formally arrested. The

recovered weapon was taken into custody by the police. Accused Harnoor Singh @ Noor suffered a disclosure statement to the effect that he had purchased the recovered weapon from the present petitioner, who was nominated as such. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail, which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal vide order dated 19.03.2026.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. Co-accused, Harnoor Singh @ Noor has already been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. It is argued by her that the recovered weapon had been sold by the petitioner to co-accused for a sum of Rs.70,000/-. The petitioner is a man of criminal antecedents as 02 more cases of similar nature have been registered against him. It is also submitted that for the purpose of recovery of money and for conducting thorough and proper investigation into the matter, his custodial interrogation is must. Even otherwise, no extraordinary or exceptional circumstance to exercise powers for grant of pre-arrest bail in favour of the petitioner is made out. It is, therefore, stressed

that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have supplied illicit weapon to the co-accused. The allegations make out a *prima facie* case for commission of subject offences as against the petitioner. For the purpose of recovery of money and for conducting deeper and thorough probe into the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is well settled proposition of law that powers for grant of anticipatory bail should be exercised in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances and not in routine manner. No such circumstance, however, has been made out in this case. If the petitioner is given the shield of anticipatory bail that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, thereby adversely affecting the investigation. The Court is also required to see that an order of anticipatory bail does not operate as inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. Accordingly, finding no compelling ground to allow the petition, the same is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

12.05.2026

harjeet

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