



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

**CRM-M No.31868 of 2026
Date of decision: 29.05.2026**

Dara Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Rajveer Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding Section 438 Cr.P.C.) seeking the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.20 dated 01.03.2025, registered under Sections 109, 333, 115(2), 324(4), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding Sections 307, 452, 427, 148 and 149 IPC) and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Makhu, District Ferozepur, Punjab. The petitioner also prays that during the pendency of the present petition, his arrest be stayed and he be permitted to join the investigation on interim pre-arrest bail.

2. As per the prosecution case, there existed a prior dispute between the parties. It is alleged that on the night of 26.02.2025, the petitioner Dara Singh, armed with a pistol, along with the other accused



persons, entered the complainant party's house. The specific allegation against the petitioner is that he fired a shot from his pistol with an intention to kill, which struck Mandeep Singh on the right side of his chest while he was sleeping in a room. It is further alleged that the unidentified co-accused also fired shots. Besides the firearm injury, Rajwinder Kaur is stated to have inflicted blows with the reverse side of a *kappa*, whereas Manat Kaur and Raman Kaur allegedly caused injuries to the complainant side with iron rods. Thereafter, all the accused allegedly fled from the spot with their respective weapons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on account of political pressure. It is argued that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and that he is ready and willing to join the investigation. Learned counsel further submits that although the allegation against the petitioner is that he was armed with a pistol and fired a shot which hit Mandeep Singh on the chest, the said injury is stated to be a self-inflicted injury. On the aforesaid grounds, prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposes the present petition. It is submitted that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. The petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR and a specific role has been attributed to him. It is alleged that the petitioner fired a gunshot which struck the injured Mandeep Singh on the right side of his chest. It is further contended that the injury cannot be termed as a self-



inflicted injury and, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. The petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR and attributed the role of firing a gunshot at the injured. As per the prosecution case, the firearm injury sustained by Mandeep Singh was caused by the shot allegedly fired by the petitioner and the same hit the injured on the right side of his chest, which is a vital part of the body. At this stage, there is nothing on record to substantiate the contention raised on behalf of the petitioner that the injury was self-inflicted. The nature of allegations and the specific role attributed to the petitioner *prima-facie* disclose his active participation in the occurrence.

8. Considering the seriousness of the allegations, the fact that a gunshot injury has been attributed to the petitioner and that the injury is alleged to have been caused on a vital organ of the injured, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

9. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

10. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

11. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

29.05.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No