



CRM-M-11552-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

106

**CRM-M-11552-2026
Decided on: 19.03.2026**

GURPREET SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Sant Pal Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vinni Rana, Advocate and
Mr. Deepak Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.63 dated 19.06.2025, under Sections 103, 190, 191(3) of Bharatiya Nayaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act (Sections 109, 61(2), 194(2), 324(4)(5) of BNS, 2023 & Section 27(3) of Arms Act added later on) registered at Police Station Nakodar, District Karnal.

2. The present FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant namely, Kavita that on 18.06.2025 at around 6.45 pm, when she alongwith her family members was present at her residence, they heard gunshots, and went outside. She noticed Harwinder Singh alias



Laddu, Kamal and Gopi along with 8 to 10 other people firing with intention to kill. One of the bullets hit her husband Jugraj, hence causing his death.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the petitioner is not responsible for the murder of deceased namely Jugraj, in any manner; the present case has been registered on the statement of wife of the deceased-Jugraj Singh from which it is clear that the co-accused namely, Navdeep Singh, Mani @ Rafal, Raja @ Balraj, Lovejot @ Labbu, Dilpreet @ Vishal and Satwinder Singh @ Fatta, used to visit the place of the petitioner to enquire about Harwinder Singh @ Laddu; there is also an affidavit filed by the complainant-wife of the deceased stating that the petitioners are not responsible for the death of her husband. It is further contended that the petitioner applied for anticipatory bail before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar and vide order dated 27.01.2026, the petitioner was granted interim bail, however, later on vide order dated 21.02.2026 the relief of anticipatory bail was dismissed on the ground that the petitioner has not joined the investigation, however, the petitioner joined the same and fully cooperated with the Investigating Officer; the co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 09.02.2026 passed in CRM-M- 55751-2025; weapon of offence has been recovered from co-accused namely, Navdeep Singh @ Nav. Learned



counsel prayed for anticipatory bail as he is ready to join the investigation.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposes the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner while submitting that an innocent person has lost his life due to cross firing between the two parties; as per mobile tower location of petitioner's phone, he was at the spot; the name of the petitioner is also specifically mentioned in the FIR; vide order passed by Id. Additional Sessions Judge, the petitioner was granted interim bail and was directed to join the investigation but he has not cooperated and did not even join the investigation and this fact has specifically been mentioned by the learned Additional Sessions Judge while dismissing the anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the present petition seeking anticipatory bail.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts & circumstances of the present case and the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties, the allegations against the present petitioner is that he alongwith other co-accused and other party indulged in firing gunshots and one of the bullets hit the husband of the complainant, as a result of which he lost his life; the present petitioner has been named in the FIR, and as per learned State counsel, his presence at the spot of occurrence is established from the



mobile tower location; investigation is going on; the present petitioner was granted interim relief by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge but he failed to join the investigation and this fact is specifically mentioned by the said Court in the impugned order while dismissing the anticipatory bail to the petitioner; as such, taking into totality of the facts & circumstances of the present case and the conduct of the petitioner that he did not join the investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Keeping in view the gravity of offence and the role assigned to the present petitioner, the petitioner is not entitled for discretionary relief as prayed for and the present petition is hereby **dismissed**.

9. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

19.03.2026
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO