



CRM-M-34011-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Sr. No.207(1)

Case No. : CRM-M-34011-2025

Decided On : September 24, 2025

Gopal Krishan @ Gopi Petitioner
vs.
State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr. Himanshu Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

Ms. Yashvi Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * *

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.144 dated 15.04.2025, under Sections 115, 118(1), 109, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, registered at Police Station City Kharar, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

Briefly, the present FIR was registered on the statement of one Jagjit Singh, alleging therein that on 14.04.2025, at about 07:30 PM, he had gone to the gym namely Pro Ultimate Gym and after exercise, he expressed his displeasure over less weights available there to the trainer namely Lokesh, who in return offered the complainant to get returned his



membership. Meanwhile, the complainant also met wife of gym owner and told her what Lokesh offered to him. Thereafter, on returning home, the complainant got a telephonic call by one Ansul, who told him that they were waiting for him outside the gym. The complainant along with his friends Harjot Singh Honey, Sunny and Kirpal reached there but found nobody present there. So, he returned but on the way to his home, near Nijjar Chowk, Lokesh and his supporters raised hand to stop them. The complainant stopped his vehicle. When they were about to come out of their car, Lokesh and his supporters attacked them with sticks, swords and iron rods. In the scuffle, the complainant alleged that he suffered head injury and on raising alarm, all the assailants fled from the spot. The complainant was taken to hospital by Kirpal but the aforesaid assailants also reached there and picked up quarrel again near Emergency of the hospital. Lokesh attacked the complainant with a brick and it landed on his left hand as he raised the same to ward off the blow. Thereafter, Lokesh, Rahul and Gopi, along with others, inflicted injuries upon the complainant with swords on his back and also gave head injury to Kirpal. Before fleeing away, Lokesh also snatched complainant's mobile. The reason behind the aforesaid fight was stated by the complainant to be grudge against him by Lokesh as he was asking him to arrange more weights in the gym for the last six months but on the last day i.e. on 14.04.2025 (the day of incident), when he talked to the wife of gym owner in this regard, he got annoyed and attacked the complainant along with his friends. With all the aforesaid allegations, the FIR in question was registered.



Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. In fact, there is a cross-case, which was got registered by the petitioner against the complainant party. It was alleged therein that the petitioner was working as a Receptionist in the aforesaid gym and on the day of incident i.e. 14.04.2025, at about 10:00 PM, the petitioner along with his friends namely Lokesh Verma and Deep Raj had gone to Nijjer Chowk Market for dinner. At about 11:00 PM, the complainant party including Jagjit Singh, Harjot Singh, Amandeep, Gagandeep, Sunny, Naresh and 7-8 unknown persons armed with sticks and baseball bats came there and attacked them. Harjot inflicted baseball bat blow upon his head and other persons also caused injuries to him and his friend Deep Raj. When they raised hue and cry, people gathered on the spot and rescued them. Thereafter, he was taken to hospital by his friends Mukul and Anmol and on the way, he also met with the owner of gym namely Sahil Chauhan. It was further alleged by the petitioner that the aforesaid assailants were already present there, who again picked up quarrel and assaulted them with kirpan. In the scuffle, Lokesh Verma also suffered multiple injuries. Again both parties were rescued by the people around. Learned counsel for the petitioner urged that the petitioner is not required for any interrogation and prayed that he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel, on the other hand, opposed the present bail petition, while contending that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave in nature and his custodial interrogation is required for

**CRM-M-34011-2025****4**

fair and proper investigation. So, he does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard.

It is a case of version and cross-version. FIR was got registered at the instance of Jagjit Singh, in which petitioner was duly named. It is a matter of trial as to which party was the aggressor. Moreover, learned counsel for the petitioner has apprised this Court that both the parties had entered into compromise. Even two of the co-accused namely Mukul Bragta and Jagjeet Singh had already been granted concession of regular bail and pre-arrest bail respectively vide common order dated 18.06.2025 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CRM-M-32425-2025** titled **Mukul Bragta vs. State of Punjab** and **CRM-M-32731-2025** titled **Jagjeet Singh vs. State of Punjab**.

In view of the above, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and no useful purpose is likely to 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.

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

September 24, 2025
monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>