



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

CRM-M-27574-2026
Date of Decision:27.05.2026

Gurwinder Singh Sran

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J.

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S (438 Cr.P.C) with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.99, dated 27.04.2026 under Sections 125, 324(4), 3(5) of B.N.S and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act,{corresponding to Sections 336, 425, 34 of IPC}, registered at Police Station Sadar Jagraon, District Ludhiana Rural.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Paramjit Kaur and the same has been reproduced below:-

“Statement of Paramjit Kaur wife of Maninderjit Singh @ Sunny son of Late Master Sardara Singh, resident of Rumi, Police Station Sadar Jagraon, aged about 37 years, Mobile No. 81988-49392. Stated that I am resident of abovesaid address and I am household lady. My husband had gone to Canada for the last about 3 years. We have two children, aged about 13 years and 4 ½ years. Three of us are residing in the house along with my mother-in-law Naseeb Kaur. For the last about 20 days, my



mother- in-law has gone to Village Bourre near Sahnewal to her sister-in-law (Nannan). My husband was taken to Canada by Jagsir Singh son of Gurdev Singh of our Village, who was residing in Canada for the long time and my husband was to work with them for a period of 7 years but as they were giving less wages or even sometimes they didn't pay the wages, then my husband has left the job from them and for the last one and half year , he has started working at some other place. On the intervening night of 26/27-04-2026, I along with both of my children, had taken meals and had slept and then at about 2:20/2:30 AM, there was loud noise burst of six firecrackers outside our house. In the morning, after getting up, we saw that there were six fires of some weapon pierced in the main gate of our house due to which there were holes in the door of the house. On seeing the cameras installed in our neighborhood, it had surfaced that two unidentified persons, had come on motorcycle in the early morninga and directly fired towards the main gate of our house with their unknown weapon due to which our life has been put into danger by firing on the main gate as we had not come out from room of the house. We had been saved and we had suffered loss on account of the fire arms pierced in the gate of the house. For the entire day, we had been getting the CCTV checked of the houses, which were on the way leading to our house but we could not come to know about any unidentified motorcycle riders and registration number of the motorcycle. Appropriate legal action may be taken against these motorcycle riders. Now, I have got my statement recorded in the presence of my father Jagtar Singh son of Ram Chand resident of Chakkar, as you have met. I have heard the statement and same is correct. Sd/- above said Paramjit Kaur, Verified by Sd/- Jagtar Singh, Verified by Sd/- Randhir Singh ASI, Incharge Police Post Chowkiman, Police Station Sadar, Jagraon. Dated: 27.04.2026."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently argued that as per



the complainant, on the night intervening 26/27-04-2026, six shots were fired at the main gate of house, which had caused holes in the gate and the entire occurrence was recorded in the C.C.T.V footage. However, in the C.C.T.V footage, the petitioner could not be seen and has been falsely involved in the present crime. Even, no overt act has been attributed to him and the police wants to arrest him only on the basis of suspicion. Learned counsel further submits that even till today, no evidence has been collected against him and the complete story of the prosecution appears to be concocted on the face of it.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had fired six shots on the main gate of the house of the complainant at night. Even during investigation, the supplementary statement of Paramjit Kaur was recorded and she stated that she had come to know that the petitioner had fired shots at the main gate of the house of the complainant with an intention to kill them. Apart from that, the C.C.T.V footage of the nearby area of the occurrence as well as the house of the accused were brought on record along with concerned DDRs. On examination of various C.C.T.V footages, it had been found that the petitioner was involved in the crime. Apart from that, from the C.C.T.V footage of Village Dholan, a motorcycle can be seen going towards the village of the complainant at 02:15 A.M on the night of occurrence and after few seconds, six fire shots can be heard on the audio of the said camera at 02:19 A.M. At about 02:20 AM, the same motorcycle and two individuals on it could be seen going back to Village Dholan after firing on the main gate of the complainant. It was also found on scrutiny of cameras of the village of the petitioner that the same motorcycle and similar two individuals



could be seen going on motorcycle in the C.C.T.V footage of the camera installed near the house of the petitioner. Thus, there was sufficient material to show that the abovesaid movement of the petitioner matches with the occurrence. Still further, during the course of investigation, mobile number of the petitioner was sent to the technical cell and the IPDR was obtained and after scrutinizing the same, it was found that at the time of incident, the petitioner was present near the spot, where the firing was done and after that he came back to his house. Thus, the technical evidence of C.C.T.V footage and IPDRs corroborate the supplementary statement of the complainant and involvement of the petitioner stood proved beyond doubt. Apart from that, the petitioner was also involved in the following more cases:-

Sr. No.	FIR No. and Date	Sections	Police Station
1.	18/21.01.2011	25 of Arms Act	Payal, Police District Khanna.
2.	178/21.11.2012	308,324,323,341, 148,149 of IPC	City Jagraon, District Ludhiana
3.	24/06.02.2015	452,336,506,148, 149 of IPC, Sections 25/27 of Arms Act	Dakha, District Ludhiana
4.	06/21.01.2023	387,120-B IPC	Sudhar, District Ludhiana (Rural)

Thus, it was finally contended that custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be required.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

6. In the present case, I have perused the case file as well as reply



filed by the State carefully and I have come to the conclusion that there is sufficient evidence on record, which prima facie proves the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. Even, sufficient scientific evidence has been collected by the police and the involvement of the petitioner was there. Still further, in the present case, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be required to recover the weapon of offence and to know the names of other accomplices in the present case. Even otherwise, the petitioner is a habitual offender and does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court.

7. Thus, finding no merits, the present petition is ordered to be dismissed.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

27.05.2026
hitesh

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