

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

\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M-34717-2023 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision:31.07.2023**

**Gurpreet Singh @ Ghoki**

. . . . Petitioner

**Vs.**

State of Punjab

. . . . Respondent

\*\*\*\*

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**

\*\*\*\*

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

Mr.R.S. Khaira, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**DEEPAK GUPTA, J.**

Status report by way of affidavit of Dharamvir Singh PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Kharar-II, District SAS Nagar (Mohali), on behalf of the respondent/State is filed today in Court and the same is taken on record.

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.30 dated 07.03.2023 registered at Police Station Mullanpur, District SAS Nagar under Sections 294, 323, 427, 452, 506 & 34 of the IPC.

2. FIR was lodged on the statement of one Ramandeep Singh, as per which on 07.03.2023, when he along with his friend Pardeep were present at his home, petitioner accompanied by Navjot Singh arrived there and started calling him to settle some old score. As complainant ran inside his house, petitioner and co-accused chased him, entered the house and gave beatings to him. They also started throwing bricks and stones at the house of complainant. Amandeep Singh, cousin of the complainant was

called, who along with Surinder Kaur reached there, but they were also caused injuries by the petitioner and co-accused. The occurrence was also video-graphed. On the protest shown by the petitioner, petitioner inflicted sword blow on a Honda City car smashing its front and rear windscreens.

3. It is contended by counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated; that no motive has been attributed to him; that co-accused Navjot has already been allowed the concession of regular bail; that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and so, he be allowed bail.

4. Strongly opposing the petition, Id. State counsel pointed out that petitioner is specifically named to one of the assailants in the FIR. Attention is also drawn towards the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, who is involved in as many as six other cases as per the details given in para No.9 of the petition.

5. Having heard both the sides and considering the role attributed to the petitioner, but without commenting anything further on the merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)  
JUDGE

31.07.2023

*Vivek*

- 1. Whether speaking/reasoned?
- 2. Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No