

2026.PHHC.013358



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-63670-2025

Date of decision: 29th January, 2026

Vikram Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through VC)
Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Shahid Answer Choudhary, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 168 dated 03.09.2025 registered under Sections 309(4), 61(2), 127(2), 304, 115(2), 191(3), 190 and 310(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') (Section 310(2) BNS added later on during investigation vide Rapat No.28 dated 07.10.2025, Section 309(2) of BNS was removed) and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Lovepreet Singh @ Labbu on 03.09.2025 alleging therein that in the year 2023, a dispute had taken place between him and accused Money Singh, while they were studying in college. Though later

2026.PHHC.013358



on, they had reconciled over phone but Money Singh was nursing a grudge against him. He had been confined to jail subsequently in some other cases and after his release, he started extending threats to him (complainant). He alleged that on 03.09.2025, he along with his friends Satguru Singh and Pavitar Singh was present near Gaushala road, Sangrur, when Harman @ Bablu who was acquainted with him, reached there and offered that he would help the complainant in arriving at a reconciliation with Money Singh. He induced the complainant to accompany him. For this purpose, the complainant along with his friend, boarded the car of Harman, who took them to a house located at Dr. Ambedkar Nagar, Sangrur, where the accused Money Singh, along with the petitioner, co-accused Aman Kumar and some persons unknown to the complainant, was present. They confined the complainant and his companions in the separate rooms. The petitioner pointed a pistol upon him, snatched his cell phone, removed his silver neck chain. All of them, stripped him of his clothing and while extending threats to him, recorded a video after forcing him to apologize. Co-accused Aman Kumar and Money Singh, who were armed with rods then opened an assault upon him along with the other persons thereby causing several injuries on his person. Thereafter, they took the keys of his car and fled away. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur vide order dated 20.10.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been

2026.PHHC.013358



falsely implicated in this case. The medico legal report of the complainant shows that only three minor injuries had been sustained by him which do not correspond to the version as given by the complainant qua use of rods by the petitioner and others. There is no forensic, electronic or any other evidence to link him with the alleged crime. No recovery is to be effected from him. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. Pendency of other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of anticipatory bail to him. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be given benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while supporting the contents of the status report and assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who is a habitual offender being involved in three other cases of serious nature. Specific acts have been attributed to him. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter, his custodial interrogation is required. No exceptional or extra ordinary circumstance for grant of anticipatory bail in his favour is made out. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and by hatching a conspiracy with them, is alleged to have pointed a pistol upon the complainant, to have assaulted him and then to have robbed him of his car and mobile phone. He along with the co-accused is also

2026.PHHC.013358



alleged to have stripped him by criminally intimidating him and recorded some video. There are specific allegations against the petitioner. The case is still at its nascent stage. In case his custodial interrogation is denied to the Investigating Agency, that will leave many glaring loopholes and gaps thereby adversely affecting the investigation. The Court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule and has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extra ordinary remedy. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. Keeping in view the gravity of allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7.

It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
8.

Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

29th January, 2026
Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned

:

Yes / No
2. Whether reportable

:

Yes / No