



CRM-M-59181-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

CRM-M-59181-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 13.11.2025

Pronounced on: 14.11.2025

Uploaded on: 14.11.2025

GURMEET SINGH

... Petitioner

VERSUS**STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER**

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Himmat Singh Deol, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, DAG Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 101 dated 01.09.2025 under Sections 61(1), 351(2), 3(5) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Sadar Rajpura District Patiala. This is the first petition for regular bail.

Prosecutrix 'K' alleged that her parents had passed away and she was the youngest of the four daughters, the eldest being Sandeep Kaur. After Class 12th, she was pursuing Nursing course. After death of her parents, her *Fufad*(uncle) Gurmeet Singh son of Gurdev Singh r/o village Samgoli Tehsil Dera Bassi, Police Station Dera Bassi, District SAS Nagar had been taking care of the household. On 01.07.2025, Gurmeet Singh visited their house and told her that he would take her to village Samgoli the next day, for a meeting with her paternal aunt Charanjit Kaur. The next day on 02.07.2025, he came on his



motorcycle and they left for Samgoli. After reaching Dera Bassi, he gave her juice, after consuming which she felt dizzy. Then, he took her to a room in a house, where he made physical relations with her. Thereafter, Gurmeet Singh threatened her with dire consequences, in case she disclosed the matter to anyone. She was taken to his house in Samgoli, where she informed her paternal aunt Charanjit Kaur and her son Yudhbir Singh, who accused her of telling lies. After a week, Gurmeet Singh left her in her village. She informed her sisters, uncle Sarup Singh, her brother-in-law Mandeep Singh and other family members. Sarup Singh and her brother-in-law Mandeep Singh thrashed her and threatened to kill her. Her family members did not believe her. Thereafter she told her cousin sister Mandeep Kaur and came to report the matter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the case was false and planted. On the date of alleged occurrence, petitioner, who was working as Security Guard in LMT Thaper School, was present on duty and had marked his attendance. Even the prosecutrix was present in her College where her presence was recorded on 02.07.2025 and 03.07.2025. He further submits that paternal aunt of the prosecutrix, namely Karnail Kaur and her son Jaswinder Singh, wanted to grab her land and on their instigation, prosecutrix picked up quarrels with her sisters, injured her sister Sandeep Kaur and levelled false allegations against her relatives. Previously also, she damaged motorcyle of her brother-in-law Mandeep Singh and locked him in a room. Even Mandeep Kaur, sister of Jaswinder Singh was colluding with him to grab land of the prosecutrix. Sandeep Kaur, eldest sister of the prosecutrix, moved a complaint



to SSP Patiala seeking protection from the prosecutrix, who hit her and levelled baseless allegations against other relatives. Learned counsel further submits that a civil suit filed by co-accused Sarup Singh against Jaswinder Singh was also pending in the Civil Court at Rajpura and the civil dispute was given colour of criminal offence by falsely implicating the petitioner, who had clean antecedents and was ready and willing to join investigation.

Learned State counsel has filed status report by way of affidavit of Manjeet Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Rajpura, District Patiala. The prayer for anticipatory bail has been strongly opposed arguing that petitioner, being paternal uncle of the victim, deceitfully took her from the village and committed forcible sexual intercourse. The offence being grave, he did not deserve to be released on anticipatory bail.

Prosecutrix has alleged in her complaint that after death of her parents, petitioner, husband of her paternal aunt had been taking care of the household. Considering the relationship of the petitioner with the prosecutrix, the nature and substance of allegations against him, gravity of the offence, quantum of sentence conviction may entail and all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, it is not a fit case to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the petition stands dismissed.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

Reserved on: 13.11.2025
Pronounced on: 14.11.2025
Ajay Goswami

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