



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

105

CRM-M-62221-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 11.03.2026

JATINDER SINGH @ KALA AND OTHERS

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sandeep Wadhwan, Advocate and
Mr. Gurjot Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.
Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. GS Bajwa, Advocate for the complainant.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.249, dated 12.10.2025, under Sections 109, 160, 191(3), 190 BNS and 25, 27, 54, 59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar Rural.
2. On 24.02.2026, the Co-ordinate Bench had passed the following order:-

“This is the first petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No. 249 dated 12.10.2025, registered under Sections 109, 160, 191(3), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar Rural.

2. As per the prosecution version, on 12.10.2025, ASI Pargat Singh along with ASI Sukhwant Singh 936, HC Kalwant Singh 172, CT Yadwinder Singh 1912, CT Ajay Sehbaz 1738 and CT Rupinderjit Singh 1953 and PHG Amar Singh 3546 were present in the area of Adda Chogawan, Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar Rural, on patrolling duty for checking suspicious and anti-social elements. A secret information was received that between 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM, two rival groups armed with deadly weapons would assemble and fire at each other. On one side, the persons named were Jitinder Singh @ Kala son of Karaj Singh, Amandeep Singh son of Sakatar Singh, Dalbir Singh son of Massa Singh, Nirmal Singh son of Kashmir Singh, Shamsher Singh son of Savinder Singh, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi Bombay Wale son of Dhanjit Singh and Sonu Khatri son of Narinder Singh, all residents of village Chogawan, along with 10/11 unknown persons. On the other side were Sahib Singh son of Mangal Singh, Surjit Singh son of Bhagwan Singh, Jagdeep Singh son of Kulwant Singh, Gurmej Singh son of Iqbal Singh and Gurmail Singh son of Iqbal Singh, residents of Chogawan, along with 12/13 unknown persons. It is alleged that both the parties, armed with deadly

weapons and ammunition, fired directly at each other with the intention to kill, thereby creating terror among the general public. On the basis of the said information and subsequent verification at the spot, ruqa was sent and the instant FIR was registered. Special reports were sent to the Illaqa Magistrate and senior officers and the Control Room, Amritsar Rural, was informed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case on account of political rivalry and previous disputes. It is submitted that earlier the petitioners had filed an application for anticipatory bail before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, and vide order dated 09.10.2025, they were granted interim anticipatory bail. It is further submitted that pursuant to the said order, the petitioners went to Police Station Lopoke to join the investigation, however, they were not allowed to join the investigation at that time. Thereafter, the petitioners again approached the police station to join the investigation and were permitted to do so. In this regard, DDR No. 47 dated 29.10.2025 was recorded by the police of Police Station Lopoke, specifically mentioning that the petitioners had joined the investigation and were cooperating with the investigating agency.

4. Despite the above fact and their joining of investigation, the learned trial Court, vide order dated 30.10.2025, dismissed their anticipatory bail application on untenable grounds. It is argued that the petitioners have already joined investigation, no recovery is to be effected from them, and the present case is a no-injury case. The allegations are general in nature, and the FIR is stated to be the outcome of prior enmity and counter-blast to earlier cases. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the present bail application. It is argued that the petitioners have been specifically named by the Harpal in his statement, who has stated that all the accused persons, while possessing firearms and other deadly weapons, had trespassed and created terror. It is further submitted that weapons as well as vehicles have been recovered during investigation. It is contended that though DDR No. 47 dated 29.10.2025 has been recorded, the petitioners did not cooperate properly with the investigating agency. On this premise, it is argued that the learned trial Court has rightly dismissed the anticipatory bail application vide order dated 30.10.2025 and no interference is warranted.

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

7. It is not disputed that earlier the petitioners were granted interim anticipatory bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge vide order dated 09.10.2025. It is also a matter of record that DDR No. 47 dated 29.10.2025 was entered at Police Station Lopoke recording that the petitioners had joined the investigation and were cooperating with the investigating agency. The existence of the said DDR has not been denied by the State. The case in hand is admittedly a no-injury case. Though allegations of firing have been levelled, no person is stated to have suffered any injury. The dispute appears to have arisen out of prior rivalry between two groups. The complainant had stated that he would provide the CCTV footage to the investigating agency, however, till date, no such CCTV footage has been supplied to the State authorities during the course of investigation.

8. In view of the earlier grant of interim protection and the nature of allegations, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioners deserve the concession of interim anticipatory bail.

9. Accordingly, in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on interim anticipatory bail subject to their furnishing adequate bail bonds surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer concerned. The petitioners shall join investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation. They shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

10. List on 11.03.2026.”

3. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the afore-mentioned order, the petitioners have not only joined investigation but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, they shall make themselves available without demur.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigating agency. She also submits that at this stage, the petitioners are not required for further custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioners is allowed and the order dated 24.02.2026 granting interim bail to them, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

6. However, it is made clear that if the petitioners fail to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to them.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

11.03.2026

ashok

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