



CRM-M-33439-2026(O&M)

1

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

CRM-M-33439-2026(O&M)

Date of Decision :10.06.2026

Jarnail Singh Rangî and Another

....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and Others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present: Mr. Sanjay Kaushal, Sr.Advocate with
Mr. Arjun Shukla, Advocate
Ms. Vanshika Grover, Advocate
Mr. Rishab Dhiman, Advocate
Ms. Vinita Chauhan, Advocate
Mr. Abhimanyu Kaushal, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab

MANDEEP PANNU J. (Oral)

1. This is first petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the event of their arrest in connection with the proposed FIR/criminal proceedings likely to be initiated pursuant to communication dated 20.05.2026 (Annexure P-1) issued by the Municipal Council, Khanna to Senior Superintendent of Police, Khanna for taking action under the relevant provisions of the Punjab Apartment and Property Regulation Act, 1995 against developer/coloniser/promoter of residential colony namely 'Rajdhani Enclave', Khanna.



2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that dispute pertains to Rajdhani Enclave, Khanna developed by M/s Rangi Associates Pvt .Ltd., wherein certain plot holders have raised allegations regarding non-providing of basic amenities thereby leading to initiation of multiple proceedings before various forums including this Court, Consumer Fora and Departmental authorities. He further submits that complaints preferred before the Consumer Fora have been dismissed upto the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission and Bank guarantee furnished by the Company has also been released by the competent authority indicating satisfaction regarding compliance of licence conditions. He also contends that due to inter-se disputes amongst the Directors of the Company, petitioner No.1 has been removed from the post of Director by other Directors whereas petitioner No.2 is no longer the Manager of the Company, and now both the petitioners have no operational, administrative or financial control over the affairs of the Company and even the funds of the Company stand frozen thereby rendering the petitioners incapacitated from carrying out any further development works. However, despite the aforesaid situation, Municipal Council, Khanna vide its communication dated 20.05.2026 has directed initiation of proceedings against them under the provisions of Punjab Apartment and Property Regulation Act, 1995, and therefore, they apprehend arrest at the hands of the police.

3. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has opposed the prayer for grant of



blanket/anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the ground that such petition amounts to abuse of process of law as grant of such blanket bail, only on mere apprehension of the accused that he might be arrested, obstructs the statutory powers of the investigating agency. He places reliance upon decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. vs. State of Punjab 1980(2) SCC 565** and **Sushila Aggarwal and others vs. State (NCT of Delhi) and others 2020 (5) SCC 1**.

4. Heard.

5. In **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia's case (supra)**, the Constitutional Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down the following law pertaining to the prayer for grant of blanket/pre-arrest bail:-

“41. Apart from the fact that the very language of the statute compels this construction, there is an important principle involved in the insistence that facts, on the basis of which a direction under Section 438(1) is sought, must be clear and specific, not vague and general. It is only by the observance of that principle that a possible conflict between the right of an individual to his liberty and the right of the police to investigate into crimes reported to them can be avoided. A blanket order of anticipatory bail is bound to cause serious interference with both the right and the duty of the police in the matter of investigation because, regardless of what kind of offence is alleged to have been committed by the applicant and when, an order of bail which comprehends allegedly unlawful activity of any description whatsoever, will prevent the police from arresting the applicant even if he



commits, say, a murder in the presence of the public. Such an order can then become a charter of lawlessness and a weapon to stifle prompt investigation into offences which could not possibly be predicated when the order was passed. Therefore, the court which grants anticipatory bail must take care to specify the offence or offences in respect of which alone the order will be effective. The power should not be exercised in a vacuum.”

6. In a recent judgment, a Constitutional Bench of Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Sushila Aggarwal’s case (supra)** while relying upon **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia’s case (supra)** has again observed that anticipatory bail should not be in the nature of blanket bail. Relevant observations are reproduced as under:-

“92. This Court, in the light of the above discussion in the two judgments, and in the light of the answers to the reference, hereby clarifies that the following need to be kept in mind by courts, dealing with applications under Section 438, Cr.PC;

92.1. XXXXX

92.2. XXXXX

93.3. XXXXX

92.4. XXXXX

92.5. XXXXX

92.6. An order of anticipatory bail should not be “blanket” in the sense that it should not enable the accused to commit further offences and claim relief of indefinite protection from arrest. It should be confined to the offence or incident, for which apprehension of arrest is sought, in relation to a specific incident. It cannot operate in respect of a



future incident that involves commission of an offence.”

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and discussion as well as the settled legal position discussed above, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition and the same is hereby dismissed.
8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

June 10, 2026
rekha

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No