



132

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-70363-2025
Decided on : 08.05.2026

Manish Gupta

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Kuldeep Singh Sarthi, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Kuldeep Singh.

Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant(s).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed 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 here-under:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Manish Gupta, aged about 30 years	143	18.10.2025	S. 115(2), 109, 191(3), 190, 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and S. 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959	Jodhewal	Ludhiana

2. In the present case, after hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, firstly on 12.12.2025, following order was passed:-

“ Prayer in this petition, filed 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 FIR No.143, dated 18.10.2025, under Sections 115(2), 109, 191(3), 190, 351(3) of B.N.S and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Jodhewal, District Ludhiana.

The complainant–Aarti Sharma has got registered the FIR,



with the allegation that, initially at the time of scuffle both accused were there namely (i) Sunny (ii) Priya (iii) Anita (iv) Shubham and during this on the call dialed by co-accused Anita, other co-accused namely (v) Amarjit Singh @ Raju Gym Wala (vi) Deepak Kumar and (vii) Manish Gupta reached there on spot.

In FIR, it has been further explained that on reaching at the spot Deepak Kumar took out a pistol from his waist, grabbed injured Vinod Kumar (husband of complainant – Aarti Sharma) by neck, and pointed the pistol at his head to shoot him. On giving a push by the complainant with her hand, bullet changed its direction and then hit on back side of the right shoulder of injured Vinod and it exited through the other side of the back.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner Manish Gupta has not been attributed any specific role except of reaching on spot alongwith the other two associates namely Amarjit Singh @ Raju Gym Wala and Deepak Kumar. Thus, prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

(3) Notice of motion.

(4) On advance notice, Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent State.

(5) Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his Vakalatnama, which is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

(6) While opposing the prayer for anticipatory bail, counsel for the complainant argues that its not a case for grant of anticipatory bail for the reason that clearly common intention is shared by the petitioner also, while coming back with armed person namely Deepak Kumar, who just on reaching at the spot fired with his pistol, by catching hold of his neck. He further argues that complete incident has been recorded in the CCTV footage also.

(7) Let CCTV footage be examined by the DSP of the area and then prepare a status report to apprise the Court about the role of the petitioner.

(5) List on 19.12.2025.”

Thereafter, on 23.04.2026, following order was passed by this

Court:-

“1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.143, dated 18.10.2025, under Sections 115(2)/109/191(3)/190/351(3) of BNS and sections 25/27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Jodhewal, District Ludhiana.

2. On the very outset, learned State counsel submits that petitioner presented himself for joining the investigation upon being apprised of the order dated 25.03.2026 passed by this Court.

3. However, counsel for the complainant contends that conduct of the Investigating Officer is not fair. Despite dismissal of anticipatory bail petition of the main accused, Deepak Kumar—who allegedly fired shot and caused injury to Vinod Sharma (husband of the complainant)—vide order dated 30.01.2026, he has not been arrested, till date.

4. List again on 08.05.2026.

5. Since petitioner was present on the spot without any weapon, he is directed to join the investigation once again, as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also



abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

6. *Let an explanation be submitted by the Investigating Officer in regard to the submissions addressed by counsel for the complainant today before this Court, failing which presence of the concerned SSP may be directed on the next date of hearing.*

7. *However, it is clarified that no threat shall be extended to the complainant or her family members, and if any such threat is issued by the petitioner, it will be open for the complainant to promptly inform about the same to the investigating officer, who shall immediately take appropriate action, in accordance with law.”*

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 23.04.2026, passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

Besides, learned State counsel informs that main accused – Deepak Kumar, has already been arrested by the Investigating Officer on 07.05.2026, i.e., yesterday itself.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 23.04.2026, passed by this Court is hereby made **absolute**.

However, 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. Accordingly, petition stands **disposed of**, accordingly.

8. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 08, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No