



227+252

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.24331 of 2025

Iqbal Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CRM-M No.62309 of 2025

Gurinder Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

Date of decision: 10.12.2025

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. R. S. Bains, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Mohan S. Chauhan, Advocate;
Mr. Anmoldeep Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Sarabjeet Singh Cheema, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-24331-2025.

Mr. Nandan Jindal, Advocate and
Mr. Tushar Sabherwal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-62309-2025.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By this order, I dispose of the above mentioned two petitions arising out of the same FIR.
2. Both the petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.238, dated 23.11.2023, under Sections 302, 307, 332, 333, 353, 186, 148, 149, 120-B



of IPC and Sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, Punjab.

3. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, SI Lakhwinder Singh. It was alleged that on 20.11.2023, Baba Maan Singh Budha Dal, resident of Ward No.10, Gurudwara Guhla, District Kaithal and his accomplice Nihang Singh, in connivance with each other, had taken the illegal possession over Gurudwara Akal Bugga Sahib Lodhi located opposite Gurudwara Shri Ber Singh Sahib, Sultanpur, regarding which FIR No.235, dated 21.11.2023, under Sections 307, 323, 324, 342, 447, 448, 511, 436, 427, 148, 149, 379-B IPC and Sections 25/27-54-59 of Arms Act, at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi was registered. It was alleged that during the investigation, 13 accused persons were arrested. Then on 22.11.2023, Baba Maan Singh Budha Dal along with his accomplices had tried to encroach upon Gurudwara of Peer Gaib Gaji Jagga, against whom prohibition proceedings under Sections 107, 150 Cr.P.C. were initiated. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi was appointed as Administrator and thus, for maintaining the law and order, the police was deputed to prevent any untoward incident. When the police party was on patrolling and reached near the deputed police officials, then all of sudden, inside Gurudwara Sahib, Baba Maan Singh, Baba Sahib Pal Singh, Baldev Singh, Gurinder Singh, Avtar Singh and 35-40 other unknown persons, who were armed with wielding *datar*, *swords*, *spears (barchhas)*, *javelins* and other deadly weapons, started firing upon the police party. Gurinder Singh son of Jagtar Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-62309-2025) along with



others opened attack on the police party. During this firing, PHG Jaspal Singh received bullet injury and he succumbed to the injury. 14 other police officials received injuries. Thus the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of Iqbal Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-24331-2025) surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, both the petitioners were arrested on 23.11.2023. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Both the petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Kapurthala praying for the grant of bail. However after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Kapurthala declined the bail applications filed by both the petitioners vide orders dated 19.03.2024 and 12.04.2024, respectively. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions praying for the grant of regular bail.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the FIR has been lodged with an exaggerated allegations. He has submitted that 02 days prior to this incident, FIR No.235 was lodged. He has submitted that in the present FIR, 05 accused were named, however 35 to 40 persons were said to be unknown. He has submitted that during the investigation, on the statement of ASI Surinder Singh, the petitioner, namely, Iqbal Singh (in CRM-M-24331-2025) was arrayed as an accused in the present case and thus, he was arrested on 23.11.2023. He has submitted that no overt act has been attributed to the petitioner except allegedly being the part of unlawful assembly. He has submitted that the



petitioner is behind bars from last more than 02 years and he has been falsely implicated in another case bearing FIR No.235 registered 02 days prior to the present occurrence.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner, namely, Gurinder Singh (in CRM-M-62309-2025) has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that though the petitioner is named in the FIR, however he has been falsely alleged to have fired upon the police officials. He has submitted that the alleged fire shor has not hit any police official. He has submitted that the fatal injury suffered by the deceased Jaspal Singh was attributed to the co-accused and not to the petitioner. He has also submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in another case bearing FIR No.235, dated 21.11.2023.

6. Learned counsels for the petitioners have submitted that in the facts and circumstances, both the petitioners deserve to be granted bail.

7. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsels for the petitioners. He has submitted that the petitioners are not only the part of unlawful assembly, rather, they have attacked upon the police officials. He has submitted that due to the fire arm injury, 14 police officials suffered injuries and one died. He has submitted that during the investigation, it has been found that petitioner, namely, Gurinder Singh (in CRM-M-62309-2025) was armed with a weapon, which he fired but did not hit anyone. He, on instructions has submitted that out of total 51 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined. He has produced



custody certificates of both the petitioners today in the Court, which are taken on record.

8. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

9. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the dispute in the present case is regarding taking the possession of Gurudwara. The parties are involved in civil cases as well. Petitioner, namely, Gurinder Singh (in CRM-M-62309-2025) though is named in the FIR, however the petitioner, namely, Iqbal Singh (in CRM-M-24331-2025) has been arrayed as an accused in the present case during the investigation. It has been alleged that both the petitioners fired upon the police officials, however the same did not hit anyone. The petitioners are behind bars since 23.11.2023. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioners have suffered incarceration of 02 years and 11 days as on 09.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner, namely, Iqbal Singh (in CRM-M-24331-2025) is involved in 02 more cases, however in 01 case, he is on bail, whereas the petitioner, namely, Gurinder Singh (in CRM-M-62309-2025) is involved in 01 more case, however in that case he is on bail. Only 02 witnesses have been examined, out of total 51 prosecution witnesses.

10. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

11. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the



sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsels for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for the grant of bail.

12. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed and the petitioners, namely, Iqbal Singh and Gurinder Singh are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. However, if the petitioner, namely, Iqbal Singh (in CRM-M-24331-2025) does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

10.12.2025

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE