

103(11)

2026:PHHC:032753



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

CRM-M-64039-2025

Date of decision :27.02.2026

NIRVAIL SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. PBS Goraya, Advocate with
Mr. SPS Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, Advocate with
Mr. Sahil Koul, Advocate
for the complainant.

(THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING)

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 BNSS in case bearing DDR No.10 dated 08.07.2025 registered under Sections 109, 125, 191(3), 190, 324(4), (5) of BNS and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act in case FIR No.90 dated 07.07.2025 registered under Sections 109, 125, 191(3), 190 of BNS and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act at Police Station Kathu Nangal, District Amritsar.

Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, Advocate with Mr. Sahil Koul, has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has filed his power of attorney. The same is taken on record.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is a case of version and cross-version. The petitioner- Nirvail Singh is

stated to have been carrying a 45 bore pistol and he along with the other accused caused gunshot injuries on the person of Jagtar Singh. It is his contention that injury suffered by Jagtar Singh are from pellets which would be fired from a 12 bore shotgun and not from a 45 bore pistol. Therefore, the allegations that the petitioner was carrying a rifle and fired from the same becomes doubtful.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that though the petitioner has joined investigation, he has not got recovered the 45 bore pistol which he is alleged to have been carrying at the time of the occurrence and from which he along with the other accused fired.

Heard.

Admittedly, the petitioner has joined investigation. The MLR of Jagtar Singh would prima facie reveal pellet injuries. It would be a moot point during the course of the Trial as to from which weapon the said injuries have been caused. In this situation, non-recovery of a 45 bore pistol would not disentitle the petitioner to the grant of anticipatory bail.

In view of aforesaid factual position, the interim order dated 14.11.2025 is made absolute. However, the petitioner shall keep on joining the investigation as and when required to do so and he shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.

Petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

27.02.2026
JITESH

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