

2025:PHHC:149927



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

215

CRM-M-46625-2025

Date of decision: October 30, 2025

GURPARTAP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.80 dated 04.07.2025 under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Zira, District Ferozepur (Annexure P-1).

2. As per the case of the prosecution, on 04.07.2025, during routine patrolling, ASI Anwar Masih received secret information that the petitioner and co-accused Jashanpreet Singh @ Jashan and Dev were coming in Swift car from the side of village Noorpur Machhiwara towards village Chohla, Malloke, carrying illegal arms and ammunition with them. Thereafter, co-accused Jashanpreet Singh and Dev were apprehended by the police while the petitioner managed to escape. On the search of accused Dev, recovery of one country made pistol of 32 bore along with 7 live cartridges was made, whereas from accused Jashanpreet Singh, one pistol of 32 bore along with 6 live cartridges were recovered. Further, while fleeing from the spot, 4 live cartridges of 32

bore and one Iphone fell from the pocket of the present petitioner. All the



recovered items were taken into police possession. Hence, the present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has nothing to do with the alleged recovery. He submits that it is highly improbable for the petitioner to have escaped from the spot, especially in the presence of armed police officials. A prayer has therefore been made to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as he is willing to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submitted that specific secret information was received *qua* the petitioner. The petitioner was found to be the owner of the Swift car, in which he along with other co-accused was travelling, and his mobile phone had also been recovered. He submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for fair and proper investigation of the case and as such, he is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Heard.

7. The present case arises out of a secret information, in which name of the petitioner was specifically mentioned. The petitioner is alleged to be involved in keeping illegal weapons and ammunitions along with co-accused. As per the disclosure statements of both the co-accused, the petitioner had been the supplier of the two country made pistols recovered from them. He was also found to be owner of the car in which all the accused were travelling at the time

of the alleged recovery. So, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is



required for fair and effective investigation in the present case and to take it to its logical end.

8. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed. 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.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

October 30, 2025
Jaspreet Kaur

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

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