



251

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

CRM-M-66842-2025

Date of decision : 04.12.2025

Khushpreet Singh**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Rahi Mehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.241 dated 11.11.2024, under Section 111 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act (Section 109 and 3(5) of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar Rural.
2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that on 11.11.2024, the police party while on patrolling, received a secret information to the effect that Doni and Prabh Dasuwal were professional gangsters and they were promoting communalism and target killing in Punjab, while sitting in abroad. Their two special shooters, namely, Khushpreet Singh (petitioner) and Harpreet Singh had also fired shots in village Gharyala District Tarn Taran. It was further informed that both of them were in their white coloured Verna car and were roaming in that area. If the raid is conducted, they could be arrested along with their weapons. On receiving the information, the raiding party was constituted and they reached at the place as informed. The persons as informed, were found present at the



place disclosed in the car. The petitioner was also found sitting in the car and thus, he was also arrested on 11.11.2024. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the same was declined by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide order dated 06.11.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that co-accused, namely, Gurmanpreet Singh @ Gurman has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 22.07.2025 passed in **CRM-M-11934-2025**. He submits that though the petitioner has been alleged to have fired upon the police party, however, no firearm injury was caused to anyone. It is submitted that though the petitioner is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in the said case. He, thus, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, he deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that it was the petitioner who along with co-accused had opened fire at the police party and with common intention along with the co-accused, has committed the offence in the present case. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. He has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest.

Admittedly, co-accused, namely, Gurmanpreet Singh @ Gurman has



already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 22.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-11934-2025. As per the custody certificate, petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year and 17 days as on 03.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case. Out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

04.12.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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