



2026:PHHC:092594



2026:PHHC:092594

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

**CRM-M-36291-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.07.2026**

KARANBIR SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate
and Mr. Dipanshu Kapur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 45 dated 21.04.2026 under Sections 109, 191(3), 190 Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, Police Station Verowal, District Tarn Taran. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

Complainant Jaswant Singh stated in his complaint to the police that on 21.04.2025 at about 1.00 PM, when he, his uncle Baldev Singh along with 5-7 other persons were harvesting wheat in the fields using a combine, Karanbir Singh arrived on a motorcycle with 4-5 unidentified persons in muffled faces. One of them was armed with a double-barrel rifle, while the others were carrying sticks and swords. They arrived on motorcycle and two Activas. Immediately after arrival, Karanbir Singh fired a direct shot at him from his handheld pistol with the intent to kill. He immediately ducked and the shot missed him. He attempted to fire again but the pistol did not work. Remaining unidentified individuals started extending threats and later fled with their respective weapons. Previously also, they had intercepted him on his way



back from the fields while he was bring fodder and had assaulted him causing injuries. He remained admitted in Government Hospital, Miawind and was also medico-legally examined but did not initiate any criminal proceedings out of fear. The reason for the incident was an ongoing dispute regarding path between his land and the land of the assailants.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was falsely implicated and did not commit any offence. The FIR was delayed by one day and no injury was suffered by any person. The FIR had its genesis in a property dispute between complainant and petitioner, which was civil in nature. The civil dispute was given criminal colour only to harass the petitioner and armtwist him. In February 2026, complainant party brutally attacked the petitioner and his family members including his father, who suffered grievous injuries, but the matter was amicably settled with timely intervention of village Sarpanch and a compromise was reached. Two months after the compromise, complainant party again attacked the petitioner and his family members inflicting grievous injuries to petitioner's father and his uncle, who were medico-legally examined vide MLRs Annexure P-2 to P-6. Intention to commit murder could not be attributed to the petitioner. The FIR was based on false, concocted and improbable story. Petitioner, who had clean antecedents, was ready and willing to join investigation.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail arguing that custodial interrogation of the petitioner was required for recovery of lethal weapon used in the



commission of offence and in view of nature and gravity of the allegations, petitioner did not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Petitioner, in the wake of ongoing dispute regarding a passage, is alleged to have fired gun shot at the complainant with intention to kill him. Even if no injury was caused, the allegations are by no means trivial. There is nothing on record to show that injuries suffered by family members of the petitioner on 06.04.2026 and 09.04.2026 as reflected in the MLR P-3 to P-6, were caused by the complainant side. Considering the nature and substance of allegations, the role attributed to the petitioner, the fact that his custodial interrogation is required for eliciting useful information, effecting recoveries, it is not a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The petition, being bereft of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

08.07.2026
Ajay Goswami

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>