



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-18220-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.05.2026

Gurpartap Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.94 dated 15.10.2023, registered under Section(s) 307, 452 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sekhwan, Batala, District Batala.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the FIR, Nirmal Singh son of Teja Singh had informed that Jasmeet Singh friend of his son Harmanpreet Singh had borrowed their i20 car. He contends that the complainant alongwith his son Harmanpreet Singh had gone to the house of Jasmeet Singh resident of Buttar Kalan, to retrieve the said car on their motorcycle on 15.10.2023, at about 8.30 am, when they were standing in the courtyard of the house of Jasmeet Singh, Gurpartap (petitioner herein) son of Sarabjit Singh resident of Uppal, suddenly entered in the house from behind. It is contended that upon entering, the petitioner

took out a pistol from his waistband and fired two shots at his son Harmanpreet Singh with an intention to kill him, out of which, one bullet hit on the back of right thigh and second hit the front of left thigh of his son. He submits that on raising alarm whereupon, the petitioner fled from the spot alongwith his weapon. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested on 23.04.2024 and since then he has been in custody. He submits that only 02 out of the total 22 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude. It is also contended that the complainant as well as injured-Harmanpreet Singh stand examined. He contends that even though, there are certain other criminal antecedents against the petitioner, however, out of total 15 other cases registered against him, he stands acquitted in 08, 01 quashed on the basis of compromise, 01 conviction under Section 379-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and quashing rapat stands filed in 01 and only 02 are pending trial.

3. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects.

4. Without going into the merits of the case and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner i.e. more than two years in the present case registered under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, the stage of the trial wherein only 02 out of the total 22 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

5. Accordingly, the instant petition is ***allowed*** and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

6. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

08.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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