



220

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

**CRM-M-33327-2026
Date of decision: 17.06.2026**

JAGJIT SINGH ALIAS JAGDISH SINGH

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Prabhjot Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Bikram Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. Hardeep Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.22 dated 02.03.2026, under Sections 109(1), 126(2), 115(2), 191(3), 190 and 351(2) of BNS (Section 103 of BNS added later on (corresponding Sections 307, 341, 323, 148, 149, 506 and 302 of the IPC), registered at Police Station Julkan, District Patiala, Punjab.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and there was no direct role attributable to him in the incident, which caused the death of one Sanmeet



Singh. He further submitted that it was because of the false implication of the petitioner that he has filed the present petition for grant of anticipatory bail and he is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer and will also fully cooperate with the investigation process.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Vipin Pal Yadav, Addl. A.G., Punjab submitted that the petitioner is the main accused in the present case and direct role has been attributed to him. While referring to the FIR, he submitted that as per the allegations levelled therein, the fight had started at the instance of the present petitioner. He further submitted that as per the FIR, on 01.03.2026, the complainant-Bhupinder Singh along with Sanmeet Singh (deceased) and other family members attended the bhog ceremony at the house of one Gurpinder Singh and thereafter, returned to their respective homes. However, in the evening when the complainant and aforesaid Sanmeet Singh, who was working as a Driver and one another person, namely, Manpreet Singh were sitting at a shop near a Bank in their village, then at about 07:30-08:00 P.M, the present petitioner and his son came to the said shop to return a stone-crusher machine which they had taken on rent. Thereafter, one Somnath on whose shop the aforesaid persons were sitting told the petitioner that he had broken a part of the machine and it was because of this reason that an altercation took place, whereupon the present petitioner started arguing with Somnath, Manpreet Singh and Sanmeet Singh and started talking loudly and when he was stopped, he punched the aforesaid Manpreet Singh with his hand and as he was wearing a *kada* on his hand, the same hit the head of Manpreet Singh as a result of which



blood started oozing from his head. After some time, when the complainant and Sanmeet Singh were taking Manpreet Singh to a medical store for treatment, then on the way when they reached in front of the house of Gurdev Singh alias Akshay, they saw 10-12 other persons along with the petitioner, who attacked them and in the said attack, Sanmeet Singh was hit on the head by the accused persons and ultimately, the aforesaid Sanmeet Singh died after about three days.

4. Learned State counsel submitted that the petitioner is the main accused in the present case at whose instance the fight had started and he had a dispute with the aforesaid person, namely, Somnath, at whose shop the complainant along with Manpreet Singh and Sanmeet Singh was sitting. He further submitted that in the present case, direct role has been attributed to the petitioner and for the purpose of ascertaining the truth and also for the recovery of weapons used in the offence, his custodial interrogation is necessary and therefore, prayed for dismissal of the present petition seeking grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submitted that the petitioner is the main accused in the present case, at whose instance the fight had started and a motive was attributable to him.

6. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

7. A perusal of the FIR would show that as per the allegations, the fight had started at the instance of the present petitioner. As per the allegations, the petitioner had hit on the head of one Manpreet Singh, as a result of which blood started oozing from his head. It was further alleged that in the evening, some more persons joined the petitioner and another fight took place, in which



the aforesaid Sanmeet Singh was injured and thereafter, he died after about three days.

8. This Court is of the view that considering the aforesaid role attributable to the petitioner and the allegations made in the FIR as well as the submission made by the learned State counsel that for the purpose of ascertaining the truthful position and recovery of the weapons used in the offence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in the present case carries weight and cannot be ignored.

9. Therefore, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that there is no merit in the present petition seeking grant of anticipatory bail.

10. Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

11. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and is meant for the purpose of deciding the present petition only.

17.06.2026
Chetan Thakur

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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