

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

CRM-M-12210-2020 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-27.5.2020

Nirmal Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Ramnish Puri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

*(the aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing  
since the proceedings are being conducted in Virtual Court)*

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.**

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No.2 dated 2.1.2020 under Sections 302/120-B/148/149 IPC and Section 25,27 of Arms Act at Police Station Majitha, District Amritsar.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Charanjit Kaur wherein it has been alleged that on 1.1.2020, her brother-in-law '*jeth*' namely Gurdeep Singh had gone to Gurdwara to pay obeisance and at about 8 p.m. when he was returning back home and reached near the house of Kabal Singh where the complainant was waiting for her sister-in-law, three young persons riding a motorcycle, out of whom one was Sikh and two were Hindus and who were all about 24-25 years fired from their pistol at Gurdeep Singh and fled away from the spot. Although Gurdeep Singh was taken to hospital but he could not survive. It is further alleged therein that Harmanjeet Singh and his father Nirmal Singh had threatened to kill him during elections and that they

strongly suspect that Gurdeep Singh had been murdered by Harmanjeet Singh and his father in connivance with unknown persons.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that in any case he is not stated to be amongst the persons who were riding the motorcycle and that in these circumstances, the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.
4. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and it is a case of brutal murder wherein as many as eight bullet injuries were found on the person of the deceased, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. The learned counsel submits that there are two other cases against the petitioner, one under Excise Act and one under Section 279/337 IPC and that the petitioner and his son had been suspecting that it is the deceased who furnished information to the police against them and on account of which they had conspired to get the deceased eliminated.
5. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and that it is a case of firearm injuries and that there is even a motive with the petitioner for getting the deceased eliminated, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail.
7. The petition is sans any merits and is hereby dismissed.

**27.5.2020**

kamal

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)**  
**Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No