



CRM-M-3697-2026

-1-

107

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

CRM-M-3697-2026

Date of decision :18.03.2026

BEANT SINGH

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Ankur Mittal, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur, Advocate
Mr. Siddhanth Arora, Advocate and
Mr. Sakal Sikri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. K.B. Raheja, Advocate
for the complainant.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (ORAL)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case DDR No.0002 dated 16.09.2023 (Annexure P-2) registered under Sections 307,323,336,148,149 and Sections 25, 54, 57 and 59 of Arms Act at Police Station Fatehgarh Panjtoor, District Moga in FIR No.0056 dated 15.09.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 452, 323, 506, 427, 336, 148, 149 IPC at Police Station Fatehgarh Panjtoor, District Moga.

2. The learned Senior counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was found to be innocent. However, he has been

summoned under Section 190 Cr.P.C. In terms of the order dated

**CRM-M-3697-2026****-2-**

22.01.2026, he has been directed to surrender before the Trial Court. He has surrendered and has been released on bail. He, therefore prays that his interim bail be confirmed.

3. On the other hand, the learned State counsel admits that the petitioner was exonerated during the course of investigation and has been summoned to face trial under Section 190 Cr.P.C.

4. The learned counsel for the complainant contends that the petitioner has been exonerated only after he had joined a particular dispensation in the State of Punjab. Therefore, his exoneration is bad and therefore, the anticipatory bail granted to him is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. On 22.01.2026, the following order was passed:-

“Petitioner, who is accused in DDR No.0002 dated 16.09.2023 registered against him and others (arising out of FIR No.0056 dated 15.09.2023), for commission of offences punishable under Sections 307,323,336,148,149 IPC and Section 25,54,57,59 of Arms Act registered at P.S Fatehgarh Panjtoor, District Moga, has filed the instant petition, praying for grant of pre-arrest bail.

Relevant facts as emerging from the documents on record be noticed hereinbelow:

In the late evening of 14.09.2023, on receipt of ruqa from the hospital regarding admission of injured, police officials arrived at the hospital and sought permission of the Doctor on duty to record the statement of Gurjeet Kaur, who had suffered four injuries (all of which have since been declared as ‘Simple in nature). Even though Doctor had opined her fit, she did not get her statement recorded on the same evening. Rather, her husband Jarnail Singh (brother of co-accused Mehal Singh) filed a complaint on 15.09.2023 levelling



CRM-M-3697-2026

-3-

serious allegations against Gurjeet Kaur, her brother Gurmit Singh and others. Consequently, a formal case vide FIR No.0056 dated 15.09.2023 was registered against Gurmit Singh, Gurjeet Kaur and others under Sections 452,323,506,427,336,148,149 IPC.

In his statement, Jarnail Singh alleged that he was married to Gurjeet Kaur in 2002. Their married life was not smooth due to temperamental differences. At about 5.15 pm on 14.09.2023, about 15-20 persons arrived at his residence, including brother of his wife namely, Gurmit Singh, all of whom were armed with baseball bats and stick etc. They forcibly entered the house and unleashed an attack in which he was mercilessly assaulted and the household articles were badly damaged. In this incident, Jarnail Singh further alleged that he suffered multiple injuries. Kiranpreet Kaur who had rushed to his rescue was also assaulted. Both the injured were rushed to the hospital.

At about 2.45 am on 16.09.2023, DDR No.0002 was registered at the instance of Gurmit Singh (brother of Gurjeet Kaur) against Beant Singh, present petitioner, Mehal Singh, Sewa Singh, Kiranpreet Kaur etc. Gurmit Singh in his complaint alleged that his brother-in-law Jarnail Singh and family members had been pressuring Gurjeet Kaur to consent to second marriage of Jarnail Singh, as the couple had only two daughters. When Gurjeet Kaur refused, she was assaulted and an attempt was made to forcibly administer poison to her. She resisted. Her in-laws were not successful. When he (Gurmit Singh, brother of Gurjeet Kaur) tried to intervene, gun shots were fired at him by present petitioner injuring his shoulder and leg. In the incident, he suffered serious injuries. It was further alleged by Gurmit Singh that Mehal Singh and others raised lalkara and exhorted others present at the time to finish Gurjeet Kaur. Mehal Singh also gave kick blows on her stomach, while Sewa Singh and Kiranpreet Kaur tried to force her to consume poison.

On the basis of said complaint, aforesaid DDR No.0002 dated

**CRM-M-3697-2026****-4-**

16.09.2023 was registered against the petitioner and others under Section 307 IPC. Police Authorities carried out investigation and were of the opinion that Mehal Singh, Sewa Singh and Beant Singh (P) were not present at the spot. Resultantly, these three were declared innocent and were kept in column No.2. On culmination of investigation in case FIR No.0056, final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C was prepared against Sukhdev Singh and others.

It further emerges from the documents on record that being aggrieved of the action of the Investigating Officer vide which Beant Singh, present petitioner, Sewa Singh and Mehal Singh were found innocent, complainant party (Gurmit Singh, Gurjeet Kaur and others) filed a petition bearing CRM-M-55144-2024 requesting for independent investigation. Since the final report had already been prepared, aforesaid petition was disposed of with the liberty to the complainant party to pursue their remedy before the learned trial Court. Another petition bearing CRM-M-11359- 2025 filed by Gurmit Singh and Gurjeet Kaur, was also disposed of, in terms of order dated 28.02.2025 vide which learned Magistrate was directed to consider all the reports and objections raised against the investigation while deciding application under Section 210 of BNSS.

Invoking the power under Section 210 of BNSS, petitioner was summoned by the learned Magistrate to face trial for the commission of offence punishable under Section 307,323,336,148,149 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act along with Sewa Singh and Mehal Singh etc. Admittedly, said order has also been assailed by the petitioner vide CRM-M-50403-2025 wherein notice of motion has been issued.

Apprehending his arrest, petitioner approached the learned Sessions Court for grant of anticipatory bail. Same came to be dismissed vide order dated 22.08.2024. Aggrieved of which, present petition has been filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the factual backdrop of the case as stated hereinabove, it is clear that the



CRM-M-3697-2026

-5-

petitioner has been falsely implicated. CCTV footage collected from the site indicates that the petitioner was not present at the site. For the said reason, he was kept in column No.2. It is further the stand of learned counsel that in the complaint Gurmit Singh had alleged that present petitioner Beant Singh, who was armed with a pistol, had fired a shot at him on his left leg. Attention of the Court has been drawn to the MLR dated 14.9.2023 prepared by Civil Hospital, Moga, wherein no corresponding gunshot injury was noticed by the treating Doctor on the left leg. Learned counsel has next drawn the attention of the Court to the photographs (Annexures P-7 to P-9, respectively), a bare perusal of which, all to him, indicates that petitioner was not present at the site at the time of alleged occurrence.

Learned counsel further contends that if the sequence of events had unfolded in the manner as portrayed by complainant, who had allegedly suffered gunshot injuries, he would have been in the hospital. Rather, photograph (Annexure P-8) shows that complainant is present outside the house of the petitioner. Furthermore, there is no explanation forthcoming as to why the complainant left the hospital against medical advice. It is further the submission of learned counsel that the falsity of the case set up by the complainant party, namely, Gurmit Singh is apparent from the fact that though Gurjeet Kaur, who had suffered only simple injuries in the incident was opined 'fit' by the treating Doctor, however, when the police Authorities reached at the hospital, she did not lodge any complaint. Rather, her husband Jarnail Singh was the first to get criminal proceedings initiated by lodging FIR No.56 dated 15.09.2023 against Gurmit Singh and Others under Sections 452,323,306,336,427,148,149 IPC. Only as a counter blast thereto and with a view to level scores with Jarnail Singh and his family members, DDR No.0002 dated 16.09.2023 was lodged by giving an exaggerated and colored version. Even no



CRM-M-3697-2026

-6-

material has been placed on record to prove that gun shot was fired.

Considering the entire facts and incriminating circumstances, the police authorities did not find any substance in the allegations levelled against the petitioner, therefore, the present petitioner and two others, namely, Mehal Singh and Sewa Singh were kept in column No.2. Learned counsel contends that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not needed and he is willing to surrender before the Court concerned.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and prays for time to file status report.

Mr. K.B. Raheja, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of complainant.

Adjourned to 2.2.2026.

To be tagged with CRM-M-73452-2025.

Meanwhile, petitioner is directed to surrender/appear before the trial Court/Duty Magistrate within a period of one week from today. On his doing so, learned trial Court shall release the petitioner on bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to its satisfaction. ”

7. In deference to the aforementioned order, the petitioner has surrendered before the Trial Court and has been released on bail.

8. In view of the above, the bail granted to the petitioner is confirmed subject to furnishing fresh bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

9. Disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

JITESH

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No

2026:PHHC:042720



CRM-M-3697-2026

-7-