



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

CRM-M-60307-2024

Date of Decision:15.02.2025

Gurdeep Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Tanvir S. Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepinder Singh Brar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Aminder Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case DDR no. 20, dated 09.08.2024, under Sections 126(2), 118(1), 118(2), 115(2), 351(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190, 324(4) of B.N.S (Sections 118(1) and 118(2) of B.N.S added later on), registered at Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur in case FIR No. 58, dated 07.08.2024, registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 351(2), 191(3) and 190 of B.N.S., 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is simply shown to be present at the place of occurrence and no overt act has been attributed to him. He further contends that three persons namely Amritpal Singh, Jasveer Singh @ Jassa and Armanjot Singh @ Kala have suffered

gunshot injuries. Learned counsel has also placed reliance on the MLRs (Annexures P-3 to P-6) to contend that Amritpal Singh, Jasveer Singh @ Jassa Armanjot Singh @ Kala and Harpreet Singh @ Honey had suffered serious injuries on their persons. He further contends that a cross version has been got registered by complainant after a delay of 03 days. He further contends that the present FIR has been registered against the petitioner under political pressure and has been falsely involved by the police. Learned counsel further contends that a cross version has also been registered against the complainant side and the question of aggressor is yet to be decided by the Trial Court, during the course of trial.

3. On the other hand learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner along with other co-accused had caused serious injuries to the complainant side and the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. From the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, it emerges that the petitioner was simply shown to be present at the place of occurrence and no specific injury has been attributed to him. Moreover, four persons on the side of the petitioner had also suffered injuries and the question of aggressor is yet to be decided by the Trial Court, during the course of trial.

6. Thus, without commenting any further, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Sections 482 (2) of B.N.S.S. It will be open for the

Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join the investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and she shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

15.02.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No