



103

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33039-2025
Decided on : 25.02.2026

Rajbir Singh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. In the present case, on 23.06.2025, following order was passed
by this Court:-

“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 First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rajbir Singh, aged about 33 years	26	04.02.2025	111 of BNS, Sections 21/23/25/27-A/29 of NDPS Act and Section 25 of the Arms Act and Sections 3/4/5 of Official Secrets Act	Gharinda	Amritsar

2. Counsel for the petitioner contends that even if the version of the FIR is taken to be correct, it is found that only name of the petitioner Rajbir Singh has been disclosed by the secret informant to the Police Officials. Apart this, at the time of stopping of the vehicle and effecting of recovery in the presence of Sh. Lakhwinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Atari, District Amritsar Rural, only accused-Amritpal Singh, Mandeep Singh and Madhav Sharma were noticed on spot in black coloured Verna car, bearing Temporary No.CH-120134. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was neither found in the company of the accused persons who were present in the car, nor he was present at the time when the recovery was effected. The recovery was made solely on the basis of the disclosure statements given by the three named accused. Petitioner is serving as an Indian Army Naik (Trade Driver) on a temporary duty in a military hospital, near Nasik in the State of Maharashtra. Even, name of the petitioner is not found mentioned or involved in any manner during the course of investigation till the time of effecting recovery or even registration of FIR. Thus, custodial interrogation of the petitioner, without there being any substantial reason with the investigation agency, would be



of no consequence and meaningful purpose. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

6. *Adjourned to 26.08.2025, to enable learned State counsel to file status report in the matter.*

7. *In the meanwhile, petitioner shall not be arrested. However, question of joining of investigation of the petitioner would be examined on the next date of hearing after reviewing the status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel.*

8. *It is expected that status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel, shall be submitted highlighting the alleged connection of the petitioner with the already arrested accused. It is anticipated that any such linkage, if at all, would be supported by some form of substantive evidence.”*

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the instant petition has been rendered infructuous, as the petitioner has already been arrested in some other case.

3. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner, **present petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 25, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No