

**CRM-M-22716-2025****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.****Sr. No.207****Case No. : CRM-M-22716-2025****Decided On : May 27, 2025**

Guramanat Singh @ Manat Petitioner
vs.

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P. S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.36 dated 09.03.2025, under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur.

The prosecution version in this case is that on 09.03.2025, during routine patrolling, a secret information was received by the complainant SI Navjot Singh that accused Karan Gajpal and Yuvraj @ Yuvi, in furtherance of their common intention, were keeping fire arms along with ammunition with them without any license. It was further informed that if raid was conducted, Karan Gajpal could be apprehended and illegal fire arms and ammunition could be recovered from him. Accordingly, the police party reached the place disclosed by the informer and Karan Gajpal was



apprehended, who disclosed that he was a drug addict and was also indulged in the business of selling intoxicants and was having passion of keeping fire arms with him. He also informed the police that he had purchased an illegal .32 bore pistol from Yuvraj @ Yuvi but as the same was not working properly, he returned it to Yuvraj @ Yuvi, who was then roaming in the area of Bajwara, Hoshiarpur. Thereafter, the police party, on the identification of aforesaid Karan Gajpal, apprehended Yuvraj @ Yuvi and from the left pocket of his trouser, .32 bore pistol was recovered and after removing the magazine of the same, two live rounds of .32 bore were got recovered, which were without any license or permit. Later, Yuvraj @ Yuvi made a disclosure statement that he had got the firearm in question from the petitioner. In this way, petitioner was nominated in the present FIR.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Yuvraj @ Yuvi, which is not permissible in law. No firearm has been recovered from the petitioner and his custodial interrogation is not required. He submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation and he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Notice in this case was issued on 30.04.2025 and Status Report was called from the State, which was filed on the last date of hearing i.e. 12.05.2025.

Learned State counsel, while opposing the present bail petition, contended that it was the petitioner, who had supplied firearm to the co-accused Yuvraj @ Yuvi. So, his role cannot be neglected as far as keeping



of firearm without any license is concerned. Therefore, he does not deserve to be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard.

As per the allegations, name of the petitioner surfaced in the statement of co-accused Yuvraj @ Yuvi, from whom .32 bore pistol along with two live cartridges of .32 bore were recovered. Except the statement of co-accused, presently there is no other material on record to show that the petitioner was supplier of illicit firearm. Nothing is to be recovered from him. No useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on furnishing bail/surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer, subject to the conditions, as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

May 27, 2025
monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ?	Yes/No.
Whether reportable ?	Yes/No.