



CRM-M-7692-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-7692-2025

Date of Decision: 23.03.2026

Gurjant Singh @ Janti

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Chandan Singh Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Anmol Puri, Advocate, for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.285 dated 20.11.2024, registered under Sections 109, 61(2), 115(2), 191(3) and 190 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act (Sections 333 and 324 of BNS added lateron), at Police Station Sadar Ferozepur, District Ferozepur.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Mukhtiar Singh @ Mukha. It was alleged that his relative Gurdeep Singh had to take Rs.5 lacs from Balkar Singh. Gurdeep Singh convened panchyat many times for this purpose, but, Balkar Singh had not returned the said amount. On 20-11-2024, at about 11:00/12:00 noon, his relative Gurdeep Singh, his wife Pallo and other relatives and repectables of the village have gathered in this regard. Balkar Singh made a telephonic call to Pallo and told her that no money has been given to him and he also used abusive language. Upon which, Gurdeep Singh, Pallo Bai and other persons were talking in this regard in the street near the house of Sukhdev Singh. At that time, Balkar Singh and other persons armed with weapons and wooden sticks came there



for the purpose of quarrel and attacked them with the brick bats. Nishan Singh @ Buta Singh fired a shot from his pistol in order to kill Shankar from the roof of house of Bohar Singh, which hit on the left side of chest of Shankar and he fell down. Jagdish @ Raju fired a shot from his pistol towards the complainant with intention to kill him, which hit on his right leg and he fell on the ground. Gurjant Singh @ Janti (petitioner) and Bohar Singh made fire shots from their pistols and one fire hit on the water tank of the house of Sukhdev Singh. 7-8 unidentified persons with muffled faced who were armed with wooden sticks entered their houses and caused damaged to the houses of Sukhdev Singh, Bagga Singh and Prem Singh and caused injuries to Rajinder Singh, Massa Singh, Bittu Singh. On raising alarm, all the assailants escaped from the spot alongwith their respective weapons. The injured were shifted to the Hospital. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 21.11.2024. On completion of investigation, the challan was presented and the on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Ferozepur praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 21.01.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present petition

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case.



He has submitted that even otherwise, as per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner has been alleged to have fired from pistol, however the same did not hit anyone rather the shot hit on the water tank. He submits that the alleged injuries under Section 109 BNS caused to the complainant and one Shankar, have been attributed to co-accused Nishan Singh @ Butta and Jagdish @ Raju. He submits that the Investigating Agency have not recovered the weapon from which the petitioner allegedly fired. It is contended that thus, false implication of the petitioner is writ large. He contends that the petitioner has not involved in any other case of the similar nature, though he is involved in other cases, however, the same was under the Excise Act and the petitioner has been acquitted in two of the cases. He has contended that the prosecution has taken about 32 dates after filing the challan and hence, the charges are not allowed to be framed. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner had played an active role in the commission of offence. The petitioner was duly armed with pistol and he fired as well. He submits that offence under Section 109 BNS is specifically made out against the petitioner. He further submits that there are two injured in the present case.

5. Learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the same line as submitted by learned counsel for the complainant. On instructions, only challan has been



CRM-M-7692-2025

-4-

presented, however, charges are yet to be framed. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that though the petitioner has been alleged to have fired, but the fire did not hit anyone rather, it hit the water tank. Injuries alleged to the injured were attributed to the co-accused. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 04 months & 01 day as on 22.03.2026. It further shows that though the petitioner is involved in three cases under the Excise Act, however, in two cases he has been acquitted.

7. 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 sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. 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 trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

23.03.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No