



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

208

CRM-M-18608-2026 (O&M).

Date of Decision: 16.04.2026.

Gurpreet Singh alias Mani

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Vishal Munjal, Advocate and
Ms. Bindu Bala, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner-Gurpreet Singh alias Mani, aged 30 years, has filed this petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.260 dated 17.12.2025 under Sections 109, 351(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act (Sections 61(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 added later on, whereas Sections 190 and 191(3) of BNS, 2023 were deleted, registered at Police Station Chheharta, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that first bail petition (CRM-M-6740-2026) was withdrawn with liberty to file a fresh one on same cause of action with better particulars. Hence, instant second petition.

2. As per the prosecution, complainant-Harinder Singh got registered FIR with the allegations that co-accused Rattan Singh and his son

Vikramjit Singh alias Vicky, who live in the street, were building a washing centre in the same street. There was some sort of disagreement with the people of the neighbourhood area living in the same, about Government Water Chamber, which already existed there in the area. Petitioner-Gurpreet Singh alias Mani had also visited the street during night time and started fighting with the complainant and other people living in the street. Complainant further alleged that when Rattan Singh and his son Vikramjit Singh alias Vicky and also petitioner's father was present, they raised *Lalkara* and told petitioner-Gurpreet Singh alias Mani, "shoot them with your bullets, who are stopping us from closing the chamber".

Thereupon petitioner-Gurpreet Singh alias Mani started firing directly at the complainant and other people with his pistol. However, all of them hide themselves behind the pole or inside the houses to save their life.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that the allegations are false and baseless. It is case of no injury to anyone, who were present there on the spot. The pistol, with which the petitioner alleged fired shots, has already been recovered by the Investigating Officer and petitioner is no longer required for any substantive reason to remain inside jail. Thus, counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the bail on the ground that though the pistol of petitioner has been recovered from him on the same day along with two live cartridges, however, from the spot, eight empty cartridges were recovered by the Investigating Officer and, therefore, there was clear intent to cause murder of the complainant or people in the street. As such, petitioner is not entitled for the concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book along with the documents appended thereto.

6. Other co-accused namely Rattan Singh, Vikramjit Singh alias Vicky, Anil Kumar alias Akal Sandhu and Manjit Singh have already been granted concession of bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, vide orders dated 06.01.2026, 13.01.2026, 14.01.2026 and 22.01.2026 (Annexures P-2 to P-5) respectively. However, no specific attribution as against the petitioner was alleged by the complainant.

As far as role of the petitioner is concerned, even if it is assumed at this stage that, the petitioner attempted eight times by firing shots with his pistol, it is very strange that no one sustained any injury. Therefore, it will be a matter for the trial Court to determine whether there was any actual intent to cause murder of somebody or if the shots were fired into the air to frighten the people who gathered there in the street. Petitioner is already inside jail since 17.12.2025 and the pistol has already been recovered. The allegations need to be verified by leading cogent evidence by the prosecution. Be that as it may, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Consequently, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/ surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat

and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

10. **Petition stands disposed of accordingly.**

Pending application, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.04.2026

jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No