



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

109

CRM-M-68622-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 15.12.2025

Gurpreet Singh ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Vishavdeep Singh Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. (482 of BNSS, 2023), has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.95 dated 20.06.2025, registered under Sections 333, 109, 126(2), 117(2), 191(3) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 (Sections 332 B, 115(2), 324 of BNS were added later on), at Police Station Urban Estate, District Patiala.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused in the present case only on the basis of secret information and upon disclosure statement of co-accused Harshpreet Singh @ Arshpreet Singh, offence under Section 333 of BNS has been deleted and Sections 332-B, 115(2), 324 of BNS have been added. Learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as he is ready and willing to join the investigation.
3. Notice of motion.



CRM-M-68622-2025 (O&M)

(2)

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State, and upon instructions from ASI Gurminder Singh, opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there is specific allegation against the present petitioner that he was driving one of the vehicles in which accused reached the spot of occurrence and he was nominated by one of co-accused, namely, Arshpreet Singh @ Harshpreet Singh. He is required for custodial interrogation as the vehicle which he was driving is yet to be recovered from his possession. The allegations are serious in nature as the accused persons caused injuries which are declared as grievous and the offence under Section 109 of BNS is made out i.e. attempt to murder. The petitioner is involved in 3 other cases of criminal activity. Thus, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts of the present case and contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties that allegations are serious in nature as petitioner along with co-accused caused grievous injuries, which attract offence under Section 109 of BNS i.e. attempt to murder; the petitioner was driving one of the vehicles in which the accused persons reached at the spot; he was nominated by main accused, namely, Arshpreet Singh @ Harshpreet Singh, whose name is specifically mentioned in FIR; custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery of the said vehicle; this Court does not find any merit in the present petition seeking anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

CRM-M-68622-2025 (O&M)

(3)

7. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as ‘**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806’ decided on 03.08.1997**, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.
8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.
9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

15.12.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No