

2025:PHHC:129896



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

220

CRM-M-20384-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.09.2025

Kuljeet Singh @ Kuljit Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Gagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. A. P. S. Rehan, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 20 dated 08.05.2024, registered under Sections 307, 450, 506, 148, 149 and 201 of IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Ghuman Kalan, District Gurdaspur.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by complainant Gurvinder Singh on 08.05.2024 alleging that his sister Gagandeep Kaur was married with the present petitioner, who used to harass her. She had visited her parental home a few days back and was dropped at her nuptial home on 07.05.2024. On the same evening, when the complainant was present in his house, the petitioner along with co-accused reached there. Co-accused Daler Singh and the petitioner were armed with

2025:PHHC:129896



pistols. After reaching there, they started creating ruckus. Co-accused Paramjit Kaur and Sukhmandeep Singh made an exhortation to shoot the complainant. The petitioner then fired a shot with his pistol upon the complainant with an intent to kill him. The shot hit his right leg. Co-accused Pavittar Singh fired a shot with his pistol, thereby injuring right shoulder of his brother Kanwaljit Singh, who had fallen on the ground. Co-accused Daler Singh also fired a shot upon him and the bullet hit his right thigh and other parts of his body. On clamour being raised, the assailants fled away while extending threats. The complainant and other injured were rushed to the hospital for treatment. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 22.10.2024. He had destroyed the weapon of offence as disclosed by him. Offence under Section 201 of IPC was added. Co-accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. No injury, which could be declared to be dangerous to life, had been sustained by either of the victims. He had no motive to commit the crime. His wife, who is sister of the complainant, is still living in her matrimonial house. The complainant is a police official and had fabricated the injuries and had concocted a false story. Six persons as mentioned by him in the FIR have been found to be innocent. The conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He has clean antecedents. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

4. Learned State counsel, while refuting the contentions as raised by the petitioner's counsel and while relying upon the status report, has argued that

2025:PHHC:129896



there are serious allegations against the petitioner, who had fired shots with a fire arm upon the victims, thereby intending and making attempts to kill them. There are chances of his intimidating the witnesses, if released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the submissions made by both the sides.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common objection thereof, is alleged to have used fire arm, thereby causing injuries to the members of the complainant party. The injuries on the person of injured Gurvinder Singh were simple in nature. Investigation stands completed. Challan has been presented. Conclusion of trail would take considerable time.

The petitioner is in custody since 22.10.2024. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. It is well settled that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstance, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for his release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

19.09.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No