

2026:PHHC:008787



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

207-1

CRM-M-68039-2025

BABALPREET SINGH ALIAS BABAL

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

A N D

207-2

CRM-M-211-2026

Date of Decision: 21.01.2026

RAVI

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Ms. Jasmine, Advocate for Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-68039-2025.

Ms. Raman Preet Kaur, Advocate (*through video conference*)
for the petitioner in CRM-M-211-2026.

Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Both these petitions are being decided by a common order since they arise out of the same FIR.

The present petitions have been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioners in FIR No.117, dated 12.09.2025 under Sections 25/54/59 and 25(7) of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Mohkampura, District Amritsar.

The case of the prosecution is that during investigation, five live cartridges of .32 bore were recovered from accused Shubham Mehra @ Shoba and similar quantity of live cartridges were recovered from accused Rishab @ Peeto and the said ammunition was allegedly supplied by the petitioners herein i.e. Babbalpreet Singh @ Babal, Harmeet Singh @ Gori and Ravi @ Kandi.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case and the allegations levelled against them are general and vague.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel submits that investigation of the case is still pending and there is every possibility that some more illegal weapons may be recovered from the accused persons, for which custodial interrogation of the petitioners would be essential.

Heard.

It is well settled law that while considering the petition for bail, the Court need not go into the merits of the case and only the *prima facie* allegations are to be seen. As per case of the prosecution, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners would be required for effecting recovery of arms and ammunitions. Hence, taking into account the gravity of the offence as well as the specific stand taken by the learned State Counsel, no ground is made out to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage.

Dismissed.

JANUARY 21, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No