

2026:PHHC:090031



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

209

CRM-M-30869-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 03.07.2026

Jagroop Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Joginderpal Devgan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jashandeep Sidhu, Advocate and
Mr. Robin Singh Bhullar, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 84 dated 15.04.2026, registered under Sections 125 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Raja Sansi, District Amritsar Rural.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Surinder Kumar on the allegations that on the night of 10.04.2026, while he and his family were present at their residence, someone fired an aerial shot outside his house. On hearing the sound, he and his brother climbed onto the roof, where they saw petitioner Jagroop Singh sitting on a motorcycle with a .32 bore pistol in his hand along with two unidentified persons. The petitioner called out to the complainant by name and threatened him for supporting Gurpreet Singh in a previous domestic dispute involving

2026:PHHC:090031



the petitioner's wife. He also fired two more aerial shots and fled from the spot while extending threats to kill. The complainant further alleged that the occurrence had been captured in CCTV footage installed at a neighbouring house and that the footage had been preserved in a pen drive. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar but the same had been dismissed, vide order dated 16.05.2026.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on account of personal vendetta arising out of a matrimonial dispute. It is argued that the FIR itself acknowledges that the complainant had earlier intervened in the domestic dispute between the petitioner and his wife, thereby revealing the motive for false implication. It is further argued that there is an unexplained delay of five days in lodging the FIR. The petitioner is not seen firing any shot in the alleged footage. No injury has been caused to any person and the case is essentially based upon exaggerated allegations. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him into custody. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR. The allegations disclose that the petitioner arrived at the complainant's residence armed with a .32 bore

2026:PHHC:090031



pistol, fired aerial shots, threatened the complainant with dire consequences and acted in furtherance of a previous grudge arising out of the matrimonial dispute. The investigation is at a crucial stage and the allegations involve offences under the Arms Act. The prosecution case is supported by the complainant's statement as well as the alleged CCTV footage, which is stated to have been produced before the investigating agency. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for recovery of the weapon of offence, verification of the electronic evidence and identification of the two unknown accomplices named in the FIR. Hence, it is argued that the petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail and the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have arrived outside the house of the complainant armed with a .32 bore pistol, fired aerial shots and extended threats to the complainant on account of an earlier matrimonial dispute involving the petitioner's wife. The allegations are specific in nature and the petitioner has been named in the FIR. The investigation is still at a nascent stage and the weapon of offence is yet to be recovered besides the role of the two unidentified co-accused being required to be unearthed. In such circumstances, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner cannot be said to be unwarranted merely because no injury was caused or the petitioner disputes the allegations. In case his custodial interrogation is denied to the investigating agency, the same will leave many glaring loopholes and gaps adversely affecting the investigation. The powers under Section 482 of BNSS are extraordinary and the same are to be exercised sparingly in exceptional

2026:PHHC:090031



circumstances. The judicial discretion conferred upon the Court has to be properly exercised after application of mind as to the nature and gravity of the accusation, possibility of applicant fleeing from justice and other factors to decide whether it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail as such grant to some extent interferes in the sphere of investigation of an offence. The Court has also to see that an order of anticipatory bail should not operate as inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. The custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 482 of BNSS. The Court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule and has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extra ordinary remedy. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

03.07.2026
Waseem R. Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No