

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-8644-2025
Date of decision: 22.04.2025

GURMEET SINGH
....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Ravi Gakhar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurmeet Singh, aged about 44 years	26	31.03.2024	306 of IPC	Bassi Pathana	Fatehgarh Sahib

2. Status report by way of an affidavit of Raj Kumar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Bassi Pathana, District Fatehgarh Sahib has been filed on behalf of respondent-State. The same is taken on record.

3. On 15.02.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurmeet Singh, aged about 44 years	26	31.03.2024	306 of IPC	Bassi Pathana	Fatehgarh Sahib

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that admittedly, deceased Randhir Singh @ Roni did not leave any suicide note before dying.

Further contends that the ingredients of Section 107 of I.P.C. are completely missing, and there being no evidence, all the other co-accused namely Satkarjit Kaur @ Babbu, Rakesh Kumar @ Budhu, Gurlal Singh, Baldev Kaur and one more accused, have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail. Counsel for the petitioner refers to the orders already appended with the present petition.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that even causing of injury to the deceased is not confirmed through the medical evidence.

3. He further argues that in fact, Satkarjit Kaur @ Babbu was earlier married to the Gurmeet Singh (petitioner herein), and about two years back, a decree of divorce had been passed. She had re-married with the co-accused Rakesh Kumar @ Budhu. Thus, submits that case of the petitioner requires to be considered on parity for the purpose of granting anticipatory bail, since all the other co-accused have already been granted concession of anticipatory bail. The allegation mentioned in the FIR is to be proved by the prosecution also, whether there is any connectivity, or not.



- 3-

Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On advance notice, Mr. Jasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to respond to the submissions addressed by learned counsel opposite, and to file status report in the matter.*

6. *Adjourned to 22.04.2025.*

7. *In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

8. *Besides, the petitioner would submit/surrender his passport before the Arresting Officer and an undertaking on oath that in case of leaving the Country, he would seek prior permission from the Investigating Agency/concerned Court.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 15.02.2025, passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer confirms the said averment and submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be required now for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since the petitioner has joined the investigation and since custodial interrogation is no more required, present petition is allowed and ad-interim order dated 15.02.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute.

7. However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.
8. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

22.04.2025
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No