



CRM-M-66081-2025

1

103

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

CRM-M-66081-2025

Date of decision: 21.11.2025

HARMANPREET SINGH**...PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****...RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S.GREWAL,J. (ORAL)

1. This is a petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 0169 dated 22.10.2025 under Sections 109,125, 333, 351(2), 190, 191(3) of BNS and offence under Sections 25,27 of Arms Act and offence under Section 61(2)of BNS (added later on) registered at Police Station Raja Sansi, District Amritsar Rural.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner, armed with a pistol accompanied with his co-accused, allegedly threatened the complainant. It is alleged that out of fear, the complainant entered into his house, whereupon the petitioner and the other co-accused persons fired at the main door, forcibly entered the premises, and continued to fire in the air while issuing threats to kill the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that there is an unexplained delay of one day in the registration of the FIR, as the complainant



CRM-M-66081-2025

2

merely four kilometres from his residence. He further submits that the co-accused has already been granted concession of regular bail by the Id. Trial Court.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He has opposed the prayer for concession of bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in two other similar FIRs wherein he is alleged to have used firearms.

6. Mr. Davinder Singh Khurana, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complainant and filed his Vakalatnama in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

7. In view of the gravity of the allegations, the antecedents of the petitioner, and the fact that he is a habitual offender involved in two other analogous FIRs wherein the use of firearms has also been attributed to him, this Court is of the considered opinion that no ground is made out for grant of bail at this stage. The nature of the offence, the potential threat to public safety, and the likelihood of the petitioner repeating similar acts further disentitle him to the concession of bail. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

21.11.2025

renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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