



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

SR. No.101

CRM-M-45303-2024  
Date of decision:12.09.2024

Sukhdev Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S. SHEKHAWAT

Present: Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab

N.S. SHEKHAWAT, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.20 dated 11.04.2024 under Sections 307/452/506/148/149 IPC registered at Police Station Tarsika, Amritsar.

2. The present FIR was got registered on the basis of a statement made by Santokh Singh son of Bir Singh. At about 11.15 AM on 11.04.2024, he and his wife Manjit Kaur were present at their house and in the meantime, Mandeep Singh Mani with two pistols in his both hands, Harjit Singh empty handed, Jaggu son of Balkar Singh empty handed, Lovepreet Singh armed with a pistol, Gogli @ Goli with two pistols in his hands and 2-3 unidentified youth, who had covered their faces with cloth, had entered in his house. After entering the house of the complainant,



Mandeep Singh @ Mani declared that he would teach a lesson to Jugraj Gajji. The complainant told him that Jugraj Gajji had gone out for some work and they could sort out the issues. However, Mandeep Singh @ Mani fired directly at him from the pistol with an intention to kill him and he sat down to protect himself and the fire shot passed over him. Mandeep Singh @ Mani, Lovepreet and Gongli @ Goli fired 6-7 shots in the air continuously with their respective pistols. They went to the rooms of their house and were looking for Jugraj Gajji. In fact, the accused had an enmity with Jugraj Gajji, due to some incident which had taken place in the year 2023. With these broad allegations, the present FIR was got registered by the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case. Even the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor there was any injury, which has been attributed to the present petitioner. He further contends that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and he is ready to cooperate with the investigating agency.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner had actively participated in the incident, which finally led to the registration of the FIR. He further submits that the petitioner was referred as Gongli @ Goli in the FIR and the name of his father has been wrongly mentioned, which is to be corrected by the police. He further contended that the petitioner and his co-accused had fired indiscriminately by using pistols and the petitioner was involved in firing at the complainant in the present case.



5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file carefully.
6. In the present case, as per the learned State counsel, the petitioner has been specifically referred as Gongli @ Goli in the FIR and he was carrying pistols in his hands. He along with other co-accused had fired continuously on the complainant and his other family members. However, they saved themselves with great difficulty. Thus, keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the petitioner is not entitled for concession of anticipatory bail. Apart from that, the petitioner was stated to be armed with deadly weapons and the weapons of offence are yet to be recovered from the petitioner. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and he does not deserve the concession of pre-arrest bail.
7. In view of the above, the present petition stands dismissed.

12.09.2024  
mks

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

|                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Whether Speaking/Reasoned: | YES / NO |
| Whether Reportable:        | YES / NO |