



CRM-M-33150-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Sr. No.212

Case No. : CRM-M-33150-2025

Decided On : August 25, 2025

Gurpreet Singh

.... Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr. Amandeep Singh Rai, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 (Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.59 dated 03.04.2025, under Sections 115(2), 109, 118(1), 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, registered at Police Station Sadar Khanna, District Police Ludhiana.

Succinctly, the aforesaid FIR was registered on the complaint made by Piara Singh, a *kabaddi* player, stating therein that on 02.04.2025 at about 09:30 PM, he along with his team members was entering the ground to play semi-final match, when petitioner – Gurpreet Singh, armed with iron sword, gave a blow of iron sword on his head with intention to kill him. The said blow hit the complainant on left side of his forehead and he fell down. The petitioner also kicked him while he was laying on the ground



floor. Blood started oozing profusely from his head. The spectators, who were there to see the match, rushed towards complainant and the petitioner fled away from the spot, while threatening to kill the complainant. The complainant was moved to hospital by his father and team mates. The motive behind the alleged attack was stated by the complainant that earlier, he used to play for the team of petitioner but now, he started playing separately and petitioner was nursing grudge against the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is also a *kabaddi* player and it is highly unbelievable that he attacked the complainant at the ground where match was going to take place soon and that too, in the presence of so many spectators. Even otherwise, the injury allegedly attributed to the petitioner has been opined to be 'not dangerous to life'. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and except the present vague allegation of attack, there is no other link to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence in question. He further contended that the petitioner is an outstanding *kabaddi* player and implication in this case would malign not only his reputation but his career as well. He urged that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and therefore, he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Additional Status Report filed today in Court by learned State Counsel is taken on record.

Learned State counsel has opposed the present bail petition while contending that the petitioner had attacked the complainant, who had come to play a match along with his team mates. There is direct role in the commission of offence. He was specifically named by the complainant.



Use of sword to commit the crime could be fatal for the complainant. Moreover, such like act committed in public creates horror among general public, which is against societal norms.

Heard.

As per the allegations, the petitioner played an active and direct role in commission of the alleged offence. He was allegedly armed with a sword and he inflicted a sword blow on the forehead of the complainant resulting in bone-deep incised wound on the forehead of the complainant. The aforesaid injury had been inflicted with a deadly weapon on a vital part of the body of the complainant i.e. forehead. Weapon of offence is also yet to be recovered. So, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. When an accused is equipped with a favourable order of anticipatory bail, then interrogation becomes a mere ritual. Petitioner was also found to be involved in FIR No.141 dated 28.08.2021, under Sections 307, 324, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Koom Kalan, District Ludhiana.

Keeping in view the specific allegations regarding involvement of the petitioner in the commission of offence, no ground for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of along with the present petition.

August 25, 2025
monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

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