



2026:PHHC:044922

2026:PHHC:044922



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

CRM-M No.71019 of 2025

Amritpal Singh @ Malli

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	19.03.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	23.03.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	23.03.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the 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. H.S. Batth, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short



2026:PHHC:044922



“BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
207	19.12.2024	Khalra, District Tarn Taran	109 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 (238 of BNS added later on)

2. As per the allegations, on 19.12.2024, the complainant Harish Kumar Dhawan was present in the house of his friend Akashdeep Singh when he was called by someone. On going outside, he found Gurmandeep Singh @ Raja to be standing there. He told the complainant that Sukhdev Singh, Sarpanch of Village Khalra was calling him. On being so informed, the complainant along with the said Gurmandeep Singh went towards the turn of the street where two youths were found standing on a motor bike with Sarpanch Sukhdev Singh. When the complainant resisted, Sukhdev Singh proclaimed that the complainant should be made to sit on the bike. Then on the asking of Sukhdev Singh, shot was fired with some firearm upon him by Gurmandeep Singh, that hit his left knee. He started bleeding and raised alarm. Gurmandeep Singh again tried to fire a shot but the same was missed. In the meanwhile, his family members and others reached at the spot and raised clamour, on hearing which the assailants fled away.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Sukhdev Singh, Sarpanch was declared to be innocent during the course of investigation. Accused Gurmandeep Singh was arrested on 09.06.2025. He suffered disclosure statement saying that he was a drug



2026:PHHC:044922



addict and asked the complainant to lend him some money who in turn had abused him and feeling offended, he had called the complainant on 19.12.2024 and along with his friend Kirpal Singh and another youth had fired shots at the victim. On the basis of his statement, Kirpal Singh was nominated as additional accused. He was arrested and suffered disclosure statement on the basis of which the petitioner was nominated as additional accused. He was arrested on 14.06.2025 on the allegations that he along with the accused Kirpal Singh had gone to the spot and was accompanying the accused Gurmandeep Singh and Kirpal Singh when the shot was fired at the victim by Gurmandeep Singh. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused and was not named in the FIR. No specific overt act has been attributed to him. No recovery has been effected from him. He is in custody for a period of over 09 months. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as no prosecution witness has been examined so far. He has clean antecedents. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is in custody since 14.06.2025. He is not required



2026:PHHC:044922



for further investigation. No fruitful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. Taking into consideration his antecedents, the period of his incarceration, the role attributed to him and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves to be released on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.03.2026

manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No