



245

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

CRM-M-26046-2026

Date of decision : 13.05.2026

Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Abhaysher Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present third petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.156 dated 06.09.2024, under Sections 109/3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Ferozepur, District Ferozepur, Punjab.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant, Gurmeet Singh. It was alleged that on 06.09.2024, he had given his Vista Car for service to Jassa Mistri at his shop situated in Village Bare Ken and said *mistri* asked him to bring some parts with regard to the service purposes. He went on his motorcycle No.PB-05-AP-1386 make Splendor Plus for bringing the said parts from Ferozepur Cantt. and at about 01:45 PM, when he was returning from Ferozepur Cantt, he was alighting from his motorcycle, then two young men wearing caps with muffled faces followed his motorcycle and on



coming near to him, pillion rider opened fire aiming towards him and with intention to kill him, however, the same hit on right side of his neck. The complainant fell down and thereafter, both the motorcyclist fled away from the spot. Brother of the complainant, Gurbhej Singh, has got admitted him in Anil Baghi Hospital, Ferozepur for treatment. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. Thus, the FIR was registered, investigation commenced and petitioner was arrested on 05.04.2025. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented and charges were framed. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing counsel for the parties, the same was declined vide order dated 23.07.2025. Being aggrieved, petitioner earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-43000-2025 and CRM-M-2599-2026, however, the same were dismissed as withdrawn vide orders dated 13.08.2025 and 23.01.2026, respectively. Hence, being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present third petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR nor any overt act has been attributed to him. However, after 15 days of the occurrence, the petitioner has been implicated in the present case, on the basis of the alleged extra-judicial confession before his maternal uncle, namely, Lakha Singh. He has contended that his maternal uncle, Lakha Singh, has been examined before the trial Court as PW-1 but he has not supported the case of the prosecution. He has contended that even complainant, namely,



Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, has been examined as PW-3 and he has also not identified the petitioner. To buttress his arguments, he has contended that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind the bars from last more than one year. He thus, has submitted that material witnesses already stand examined and there is no possibility of the petitioner tampering with the evidences. He has contended that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State, however, has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the complicity of the petitioner has been duly established during investigation and it is the petitioner who fired at the complainant. He has submitted that even if Lakha Singh has not supported the case of the prosecution, there are other witnesses to prove the case of the prosecution. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 09 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrayed as accused on the basis of alleged extra-judicial confession before his maternal uncle, Lakha Singh but when he was examined as PW-1, he did not support the case of the prosecution. The complainant has also not identified the petitioner. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year, 01 month and 07 days as on 12.05.2026. Custody certificate further shows that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. As submitted, out of 09 prosecution witnesses,



03 witnesses already stand examined.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.05.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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