

2025:PHHC:071578



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

**CRM M-26290 of 2025
Date of Decision: 23.05.2025**

Manmeet Singh ...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Sumit Dua, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S., 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.10 dated 10.04.2025 registered under Sections 109, 3(5) of BNS 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act 1959, Police Station GRP, District Jalandhar.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the basis of the statement made by Manjit Singh and the same has been reproduced below:-

“Statement Manjit Singh son of Harbhajan Singh Resident of Village Pahra Village, Post Office Pattakalan, Police Station Kartarpur, District Jalandhar Age about 42 years, 9888999110 stated that I am a resident of the said address and working at Salad Master Restaurant Model Town Jalandhar. The

restaurant closes at 12 o'clock in the night and I go home after closing the restaurant and by the car. As usual today on 10-04-2025 at around 12 O'clock after closing the restaurant along with owner of the restaurant Jaswant Singh son of Kulwinder Singh resident of House No. 487, Guru Teg Bahadur Nagar, Police Station Division No. 06, Jalandhar along with vehicle number PB 08 FL 9110 Mark TATA FIGO I left the restaurant via Jalandhar City by way of railway Station. On the way of my home, when I reached the Outer Gate Railway Station Jalandhar where there are tea shops (first shop railway station Jalandhar and Jalandhar city side), there was a swift car number PB 08 DK 0918 parked in front of the first tea shop, due to which the road was jammed because the road was short and the swift car was in the middle of the road, I honked my horn several times so that the vehicle would move to the side but the driver did not move his vehicle to the side. Then I narrowly started to pass my car near the Swift car through the path that was left in the road. The driver's mirror of the Swift car was down. I requested the driver of the car that the road is too short to park the car, but the three young men in the car spoke to me in a very wrong tone. At around 12/45 AM, a swift car stopped my vehicle near the Peepal tree near Railway motorcycle parking and 02 young men came out of the swift car and one young man remained sitting in the vehicle and the 02 youths who got out started abusing me. A young man who while abusing us, fired his pistol with the intention of killing us, but due to good luck, we did not get fired. In order to save our lives, I drove my car with difficulty and went to the Damoria bridge side

so that no one was injured. The said youths have fired at me without any reason with intention to kill and have put my life in danger, legal action should be taken against the said 03 youths whose names are not known. Right- Manjit Singh, 10/04/2025”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the version of the prosecution, three persons, were allegedly sitting in the swift car and only one person had fired shots in the meantime and on seeing the firing, the complainant ran away from the spot. However, no person had suffered any injuries in the present case. Learned counsel further contends that in fact as per the witnesses and CCTV footage, car bearing registration No. PB-08-DK-0918 was used in the crime, which belongs to the petitioner. Due to the said fact, the petitioner has been wrongly involved in the present case. In fact, a friend of the petitioner had borrowed a car for 2/3 days on the occasion of Baiskhi and he had given his car to his family friend. Except that, the petitioner has no concern with the crime.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the car, which was used in the commission of crime belongs to the petitioner and he alongwith his accomplices had fired shots at the complaint side. Even, the pistol used in the commission of crime is yet to be recovered from the petitioner. Apart from that, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be required to take the investigation to its logical end.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In the present case, even though no person had suffered any fire arm injuries, yet it has been found that the accused in the present case had fired indiscriminately at the complainant. Even, not only the car of the petitioner was used, but it has also been found by the police that the petitioner himself had fired the shots and two empty shells of cartridges of 7.65 bore weapon were recovered from the place of occurrence. Thus, keeping in view the gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail. Apart from that, the weapon of offense, i.e., the pistol and car are yet to be recovered from the petitioner and his custodial interrogation would be required.

7. Finding no merits, the present petition is ordered to be dismissed.

23.05.2025

amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

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