



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-50015-2025
DECIDED ON: 10.04.2026

DALJIT SINGHPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Yagsimmant Attri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, and
Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Poonam Singh Thakur, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed second time, 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
Daljit Singh, aged about 52 years	105	17.12.2024	103(1), 109, 61(2), 62, 190, 191(3), 351(2) of BNS, Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act and offence under Sections 117(2), 118(1) of BNS has been added later on	Chohla Sahib	Tarn Taran

2. In compliance to the direction issued by this Court, vide order dated 26.02.2026 passed by this Court, affidavit of Gaurav Yadav, IPS, Director General of Police, Punjab, dated 09.04.2026, and the same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

3. Learned State counsel referred to paragraph Nos.13 to 17 of the affidavit, and submits that a Special Investigation Team (SIT) has been constituted by the Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran, vide order dated 01.04.2026. The SIT is examining the conduct of all the concerned officers, and a regular departmental inquiry has also been initiated against two erring officials, vide order dated 02.04.2026.

4. Upon perusal of paragraph No.17 of the affidavit, it appears that apprehension expressed by this Court has materialized, as petitioner-Daljit Singh, now asserts that he was not involved in the altercation at the time of the incident and had not handed over his licensed .12 bore (DBBL) rifle to the accused, Nishan Singh. He further claims that the said rifle had been in a damaged condition for the past 3–4 years and had been produced before the then SI/SHO Baljinder Singh on 20.11.2025.

5. This Court refrains itself from making any conclusive observations, at this stage, regarding the use of weapon or its involvement in the commission of the offence. However, it is evident that, in cases involving firearm use resulting in homicide, a forensic examination—particularly a comparative ballistic analysis of the bullet and the suspected weapon—is essential.

The revised stand taken by the petitioner requires careful and critical scrutiny to determine its veracity.

6. However, since petitioner has already joined the investigation, **ad-interim bail order dated 30.09.2025 is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.**

Petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. However, for the limited purpose of supervising the conduct of the department, Investigating Officer, and any other officer involved in or associated with the inquiry in the present case, **present petition is kept pending and shall be listed on 25.05.2026**, for apprising this Court of further development.

10.04.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned**Yes/No*

*Whether reportable**Yes/No*

LAVISHA
2026.04.10 14:04
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
PHHC, Chandigarh