



221

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

CRM-M-64337-2024

Date of Decision:-22.01.2025

JAGJIT SINGH

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

By way of the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) the petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in FIR detailed as under (Annexure P-2):-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
153	24.09.2024	115(2), 118, 324(4), 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS and 25 and 27 of Arms Act	Nihal Singh Wala, District Moga

2. Argument heard.

3. It is, *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case and the petitioner himself also sustained injuries in the occurrence and during course of the proceedings a compromise has also been effected between the parties, hence prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has assailed these arguments by



submitting that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of firing gun shot with an intent to kill complainant which hit right leg of the complainant, as such, he is not entitled for concession of bail and his custodial interrogation is required to recover the weapon used in the occurrence.

5. After considering the arguments and perusing the record, it transpires that the instant DDR was registered on 25.09.2024 on the statement of Santokh Singh alias Soni to the effect that on 23.09.2024 he had gone to the place of occurrence on being informed that his friend Jiwan Singh is having altercation with one Jagjit Singh and found Jagjit Singh, present petitioner, armed with revolver, Manjit Singh alias Manna armed with baseball, Jaspreet Singh alongwith two other attacked the petitioner wherein Manjinder Singh gave baseball bat blow on his back and the petitioner fired shot with an intent to kill petitioner. Injured were shifted to hospital and instant DDR was registered as a cross version to FIR No 153 dated 24.09.2024.

6. It is evident that there are specific allegations against petitioner of firing from his revolver on the complainant with an intent to kill and in that process the gun shoot hit the complainant in right leg. The recovery of weapon used in the occurrence is yet to be effected. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence, no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

7. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

22.01.2025

Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No