

2026:PHHC:042609



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

CRM-M-61801-2025 (O&M)

Sonu Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	12.03.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	19.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	19.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing DDR No. 4 dated 06.06.2025, under Sections 109, 191(3) and 190 of BNS and Section 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 having been registered in FIR No.191, dated 05.06.2025, under Sections 103, 191(3), 190, 61(2) of the BNS and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station City Ferozepur, District Ferozepur.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of



2026:PHHC:042609



the statement recorded by the complainant Pawandeep Kaur, alleging therein that accused Amrik Singh @ Amrika by hatching a conspiracy with his father Joginder Singh @ Lallu, brother Gurdit Singh, Angrej Singh and Ashish Chopra had got her husband murdered through Shivam Sehgal @ Shanga and Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of the dead body was conducted. Accused Shivam Sehgal and Simranpreet were arrested on 16.06.2025. Recoveries of illegal arms and ammunition were effected from them including 105.78 grams of heroin.

3. As per the further allegations, on 06.06.2025, the aforementioned DDR No.4 was registered on the statement of Arshdeep Singh, owner of the tattoo shop, who recorded his statement to the effect that the victim Ashu Monga along with his companion Amarjit Singh had come to his shop on the fateful day, when three persons including accused Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi were sitting in the same. An altercation had taken place between them and the victim as well as Amarjit Singh had taken out pistols. He had rushed outside the shop and had heard noises of fire shots. He further disclosed about reaching at the tattoo shop and that he came to know that it was a case of gang war and fire shots were exchanged between the members of the party of victim Ashu Monga, who were Gurjinder Singh, Noda @ Sabha @ Sarabjit, Lakha, Amarjit Singh and Dev Sharma and the members of the party of Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi and Shivam @ Shivam Sehgal. Amarjit Singh was arrested on 10.07.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his guilt and disclosed that on asking of victim Ashu Monga, he had gone to tattoo shop along with him and the present petitioner to take



2026:PHHC:042609



revenge from Shivam Sehgal @ Shanga and Yuvraj @ Yuvi as both of them had used abusive language against wife of the victim Ashu Monga, with the plan that Ashu Monga and himself will shoot Shivam Sehgal @ Shanga and Yuvraj @ Yuvi. He further disclosed that he as well as the present petitioner and their companions had fired shots with their respective pistols upon the members of the opposite party but Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi succeeded in running away from the spot. They chased him but could not get him. Subsequently, they came to know that Ashu Monga had died due to sustaining gunshot injuries. Then, Amarjit Singh and the petitioner left the place of occurrence on a motorcycle. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur but the same was dismissed, vide order dated 15.10.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this cross case. No specific role or overt act has been attributed to him. The complainant of the cross case, namely Arshdeep Singh, has not named him. He has been nominated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the above named co-accused Amarjit Singh, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. Similarly situated co-accused Dev has been granted stay on his arrest by this Court. The petitioner is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Reply has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State



2026:PHHC:042609



counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature. He along with Amarjit Singh, Mahinder and Gurjinder @ Guri had fired shots upon the persons, who are accused in FIR case. The petitioner had actively participated in commission of subject offences. His custodial interrogation is required for conducting proper investigation in the matter as well as for effecting recovery of weapon of offence. No exceptional or extraordinary case has been made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has considered the submissions made by both the sides.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, is further alleged to have come to the tattoo shop of Arshdeep Singh, complainant in cross/DDR case, on the fateful day along with victim Ashu Monga where certain persons including accused Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi were already present. An altercation allegedly took place between the parties and both sides are stated to have taken out firearms, whereafter shots were fired. The prosecution case further is that the said incident was part of a gang rivalry between the members of the party of Ashu Monga and that of Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi and Shivam Sehgal. The petitioner along with co-accused is alleged to have fired gunshots upon the members of the opposite party. He is shown to be involved in one more case involving offence under Section 109 of BNS. His case cannot be said to be at parity with co-accused Dev, as there is no allegation that co-accused Dev had participated in the occurrence. Rather, as per disclosure statement of co-accused Amarjit Singh, he was



2026:PHHC:042609



only sitting in the car. The allegations against him are quite serious. No sparing or extraordinary circumstance has been made out in his favour for grant of pre-arrest bail. Rather, his custodial interrogation is required for conducting proper investigation in the matter and also for effecting recovery of weapon of offence. The well settled proposition of law is that while considering an application for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to consider the nature of the offence, the role of the person, the likelihood of his influencing the course of investigation or tampering with evidence including intimidating witnesses. The powers under Section 482 of BNSS are to be exercised in extraordinary and sparing circumstances. More so, custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 482 of BNSS. Many useful information can be disinterred during custodial interrogation. Keeping in view the discussion as made above, this Court is of the considered opinion that no extraordinary or sparing circumstance entitling the petitioner to seek concession of pre-arrest bail has been made out. Accordingly, finding no merit, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

19.03.2026

Waseem Khari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No