



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

105

CRM-M-21072-2026

Date of Decision: 20.04.2026

GURPREET SINGH@ GURVIR @ GURI**.....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****...RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Mohinder Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS (earlier Section 438 of Cr.P.C) with a prayer for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 130 dated 22.10.2025 under Sections 351(2), 191 (3), 191 (2), 190, 118(1), 115 and 118(2) of the BNS (under Sections 506, 148, 147, 149, 324, 321, 326 of IPC) registered at Police Station Rori, District Sirsa.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with other co-accused persons had inflicted injuries upon the body of the injured/complainant- Gurlabh Singh. It is alleged that the petitioner was armed with a danda and inflicted injuries on the face, right hand, and back of the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not committed any offence. It is further submitted that the complainant has not identified the petitioner. He further submits that three other co-accused, including Gurpreet Singh @ Nikka,



have already been granted regular bail by the learned Sessions Judge, Sirsa.

The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, learned AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He has vehemently opposed the prayer made by ld. counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has actively participated in the offence and his custodial interrogation is required for making recovery of *danda* used by him in the commission of offence.

6. I have heard the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the material available on record, this Court is of the considered view that specific role has been attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the offence. Furthermore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be necessary for effective investigation and for effecting recovery of the weapon (*danda*) allegedly used in the commission of the crime. Therefore, no ground is made out for granting the concession of extra ordinary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

20.04.2026

remu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No