



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

107

CRM-M No.32442 of 2025

Date of decision : 13.06.2025

Harpreet Singh @ Happy

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Ankit Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.5 dated 14.01.2025 under Sections 109, 333, 324, 191(3), 190, 238 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Garhshankar District Hoshiarpur.

2. The allegations against the petitioner is that on 13.01.2025, complainant alongwith her sons was present in the house. At about 9.30 pm, she heard that someone is abusing outside her house. When they came in the *verandah*, she saw that Amandeep Singh @ Chinia, Harpreet Singh, Jaswinder Singh, Amrik Singh, Mandeep Singh, Pardeep Singh alongwith some unidentified persons armed with *kirpans* and *datars* were knocking their gate. She alongwith her children immediately went on the roof and tried to save themselves but in the meantime, the above said boys entered into their house and started breaking their household articles. Out of them, Amandeep Singh @ Chinia and Mandeep Singh @ Mani Gujjar who were carrying pistols fired four



shots towards them with an intention to kill them. Then the complainant party went to the house of their neighbourers to save themselves.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that although the shots were fired by Amandeep Singh @ Chinia and Mandeep Singh @ Mani Gujjar from their pistols, the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner was very much present at the spot of alleged occurrence. He further contends that the allegations made against the petitioner are grave in nature and prays for dismissal of the anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for both the parties and have considered the allegations against the petitioner. However, the petitioner was present at the spot and had also participated in the alleged occurrence by entering into the house of the complainant while his co-accused were armed with fire-arms and as such, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. In view of above, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

June 13, 2025
Sonia Puri

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