

2025:PHHC:103973



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

204

**CRM-M-6373-2025
Decided on:02.08.2025**

Gurwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bhardwaj

Present: Mr. JPS Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioner (through VC).

Mr. R.K. Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present second petition, filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.115 dated 20.07.2023, registered under Sections 302, 323, 148 and 149 of the IPC, 1860 (Section 325 of the IPC, 1860 added later on), at Police Station Sadar, Bathinda, District Bathinda.
2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Jagsir Singh, in which he alleged that he had two children. The elder son Jashandeep Singh was aged about 20 years, whereas the younger to him is his daughter Gagandeep Kaur, who was unmarried. On 18.07.2023, at about 05.00 pm, he received a telephonic information that his son Jashandeep Singh had been injured during a fight and had been taken to the Civil Hospital, Bathinda. On receiving the said information, he rushed to the Civil Hospital, Bathinda, where his son Jashandeep Singh told him that Ranjit Singh, Gurwinder Singh @ Guri (petitioner herein) and Amanjeet Singh alias Amana, along with 10-12 other unknown persons, caused him injuries with baseball bats and *daang*. His son

2025:PHHC:103973



was thereafter referred to Badiyal Hospital, Bathinda where he succumbed to the injuries. Hence, the request was made to take legal action against all the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and the petitioner was stated to be arrested on 23.07.2023 and the investigating agencies collected various evidences and on completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The learned trial Court, on framing of the charges, commenced with the trial. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda praying for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned trial Court declined the same vide order dated 22.02.2024. Hence, aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner approached this Court for grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-39017-2024, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide its order dated 20.08.2024 on the request of counsel for the petitioner. Now, the petitioner is again before this Court for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR case. He submitted that the occurrence, as alleged, in the present case had taken place on 18.07.2023, whereas the FIR had been lodged after a delay of two days, i.e. on 20.07.2023. It is submitted that the complainant had alleged that the deceased was assaulted by 13-15 accused persons, whereas there are only five injuries found on the person of the deceased and, thus, the ocular version is not medically corroborated. He further submitted that it is the petitioner who had shifted the deceased to the hospital and from the admission/medical record, the said fact is evident. He further submitted that the petitioner is behind the bars since 23.07.2023 and since the trial is not making any headway, therefore, the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

2025:PHHC:103973



4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR who, along with other co-accused, had caused the murder of the deceased Jashandeep Singh. It is submitted that the petitioner had duly participated in the commission of offence and as the trial is progressing on a fast pace, thus, the present petition deserves dismissal.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the available record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR along with other co-accused who had caused multiple injuries on the persons of the deceased. The FIR had been lodged by the complainant, who is none else but the father of the deceased, on the statement of the deceased himself who was in injured condition at that time, who had thereafter succumbed to the injuries caused by the petitioner and his co-accused.

6. Keeping in view the gravity of the offence and all the attending circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not qualify for the grant of bail at this stage and hence, the present petition, being denuded of any merit, is hereby dismissed.

7. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

August 02, 2025
vinod*

(Rajesh Bhardwaj)
Judge

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