



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

245

CRM-M-32808-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 31.10.2025

Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate and
Mr. Keshav Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi	132	30.09.2024	109, 324(4) of BNS, 2023 and S. 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 [S. 249, 253, 308(4), 351(1), 61(2) of BNS, 2023, added later on]	Machhiwara	Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana

2. As per the case of the prosecution, one Komalpreet and Billa intended to eliminate the complainant, Baldev Singh (the lodger of the FIR), and for this purpose, they hired the services of contract killers, namely; Pritpal Singh, Jarmanjit Singh @ Jerry, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi (**petitioner herein**), and Gurtej Singh. It is alleged that co-accused – Pritpal Singh was driving the car at the time of the incident, while the accused Jarmanjit Singh



@ Jerry, who was seated in the front of the passenger seat, fired a shot with a pistol. The bullet passed through the right side of the complainant's neck, exited from the left side of his neck and thereafter got fixed in his mobile phone, which was near to his left ear.

It is from the disclosure statement of accused Pritpal Singh @ Gora that the names of the other accused persons including petitioner, namely; Manpreet Singh, Kamalpreet Singh alias Billa alias Kanwal, Simranjit Singh, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi (**petitioner herein**) and Jarmanjit Singh @ Jerry were involved in the case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that initially there was a disclosure statement dated 10.10.2024 in which petitioner's name was not there and in the second disclosure statement dated 14.10.2024, petitioner name was there. Therefore, was there actual participation or not would be a moot question, also as to whether petitioner's involvement is well established or not beyond the reasonable doubt on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused is also to be adjudicated upon.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody for the period of last about 01 year. Out of total of 20 prosecution witnesses, none have been examined till date, although charges have already been framed. Learned counsel further submits that the allegations levelled by the prosecution are yet to be proved, including whether or not, there is any direct connection between the present petitioner and other co-accused namely, Komalpreet Singh and Billa, who allegedly intended to eliminate the complainant, Baldev Singh. It is also submitted that the prosecution's case relies primarily on conversation through social media i.e. Instagram and Snapchat, and the identification of the accused has yet to be established from



the victim's testimony.

Besides, learned counsel submits that one of the co-accused of the petitioner, i.e., Pritpal Singh @ Gora, has been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated **25.07.2025**, passed in **CRM-M-29985-2025**, titled as, **"Pritpal Singh @ Gora v. State of Punjab"**. He submits that case of the petitioner is on better footings than the co-accused Pritpal Singh @ Gora, as he was driving the car at the time of occurrence, whereas, initially petitioner was not named in the FIR, and his name has emerged in the second disclosure statement made by said accused Pritpal Singh @ Gora on 14.10.2024. Therefore, in view of the above and by claiming parity, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while producing the custody certificate dated 28.10.2025 in Court today, opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the petitioner has been implicated on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Pritpal Singh @ Gora. Considering the gravity of the offence, serious nature of allegations, and the petitioner's criminal antecedents, as reflected in the custody certificate, it is submitted that he does not deserve the concession of regular bail at this stage. Learned State counsel, however, fairly concedes that none of the twenty prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and upon perusal of the record available before this Court, it is observed that the petitioner has been in custody for a period of about one year. Despite framing of charges, none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined till date. The petitioner's name surfaced only in the second disclosure statement



of co-accused Pritpal Singh @ Gora dated 14.10.2024, and his alleged role in the occurrence will be a moot question for determination during trial. The prosecution case largely rests on disclosure statements and social-media-based evidence, the authenticity and admissibility of which will require detailed scrutiny at the appropriate stage.

7. In these circumstances, coupled with the fact that co-accused Pritpal Singh @ Gora, who was assigned a more active role, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 25.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-29985-2025, this Court finds merit in the plea of parity raised by the petitioner. Further detention of the petitioner for an indefinite period is not warranted, particularly when the trial is not likely to conclude soon. Accordingly, prayer for bail deserves consideration.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands **disposed of**.



Since the main petition has been decided on merits, no separate order is required to be passed in the interim bail application, i.e. CRM-36017-2025, which stands disposed of as infructuous.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

October 31, 2025
J.Ram

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