

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

CRM-M-200-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 4.8.2022

Gurvinder Singh @ Mehakpreet Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vijay K. Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Gurdeep Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in a case registered against him vide FIR No. 303 dated 10.10.2020 under Sections 307, 353, 34, 186 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar (Rural).
2. The case of the prosecution is that on 10.10.2020, SI/SHO Harpal Singh received information from Incharge CIA Staff, Amritsar (Rural) that gangster Bhupinder Singh @ Sonu Kangla who had been arrested in connection with FIR No. 280 dated 8.10.2020 under Section 25 of the Arms Act, Police Station Chattiwind, Amritsar (Rural) had made a disclosure statement to the effect that about 3-4 months back, he had given a pistol and cartridges to Gurvinder Singh @ Mehakpreet Singh (petitioner), who indulges in sale of *heroin* and that he may be apprehended. Upon receipt of said information, barricading was held and a car bearing number plate as PB07-AF was

signalled to stop but Gurvinder Singh @ Mehakpreet Singh who was sitting in the said car fired with his pistol at the police party and sped away towards village Pandori. Shortly thereafter, one Vento car and another white coloured car came from village Pandori towards chowk Gagaarmal where ASI Joginder Singh signalled them to stop. While one Hindu young man was driving Vento car, Gurvinder Singh @ Mehakpreet Singh was sitting on the front seat. Another two persons were sitting in the other car. Instead of stopping the said car, the persons sitting therein fired gunshots at the police party with an intention to kill them. Though, the police party chased the said vehicles but could not be caught.

3. It is further the case of prosecution that on the same day, a raid was conducted at the house of Gurvinder Singh @ Mehakpreet Singh and a car make i-20 bearing number plate bearing number PB-07-AF was recovered. The search of the personal room of Gurvinder Singh @ Mehakpreet Singh led to recovery of 2 live cartridges of 9 MM, one live cartridge of KF RMM 315 bore, 2 live cartridges of 22 bore, 07 live cartridges of AK 47 and 6 live cartridges of 7.62 MM.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that falsity would be evident from the fact that though on two occasions, the petitioner and co-accused are alleged to have fired at the police party but none from police party has been injured. The learned counsel has submitted that in these circumstances, there being no evidence against the petitioner, he deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that it is a case where the secret information virtually stands substantiated from recovery of ammunition from the house of the petitioner. The learned State counsel has further submitted that the CCTV cameras installed at the house of the petitioner were checked and which was found to contain CCTV footage showing that the petitioner along with other persons were coming out of the house carrying different kinds of weapons on the day in question. It has further been submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender having been involved in 4 other cases including a case under Section 307 IPC, Section 25 of the Arms Act and cases under NDPS Act and that as such, does not deserve any concession in the matter of bail.
6. I have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
7. The recovery of ammunition from the house of the petitioner in respect of which there is no explanation and the CCTV footage, the printouts of which have also been annexed with the reply filed by the State showing a person armed with weapons would certainly make out a case for custodial interrogation of the petitioner. Still further, the antecedents of the petitioner, who has been involved in 4 other cases also reflect on the previous conduct of the petitioner. In these circumstances, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
8. The petition is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

4.8.2022

kamal

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
JudgeWhether speaking /reasoned
Whether ReportableYes / No
Yes / No