



CRM-M-20765-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-20765-2026
Decided on: 11.05.2026

Gurwinder Singh @ Guri

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Kinshu Mittal, Advocate and
Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Khaira, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Lovejeet Poonia, Advocate
for the complainant

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.54 dated 24.02.2026, registered under Sections 109, 324(4), 304, 126(2), 3(5) of BNS (corresponding to sections 307, 427, 341 and 34 of IPC) and sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of Arms Act at Police Station Patran, District Patiala.

2. On 17.04.2026, following order was passed:

“(i) xx xx xx xx

(ii) FIR in the present case was lodged by the complainant, namely Jaskaran Singh, wherein four accused persons have been named, i.e., Gurwinder Singh alias Guri (petitioner herein), Ladi, Amandeep Singh @ Amna, and one unknown



person. As per the allegations, incident occurred on 24.02.2026 at about 11:30 A.M., when the Scorpio vehicle bearing registration No.PB-11-DG-0052 was intercepted by the accused persons, who thereafter allegedly caused injuries to the complainant.

It is alleged that petitioner inflicted an injury on the head of the complainant with the butt of a pistol. Co-accused Ladi allegedly took out a pistol from his waistband and pointed it at the complainant. Another co-accused, Amandeep Singh @ Amna, is stated to have taken out a gun from his vehicle and attacked the complainant with an intention to kill him. The fourth, unidentified person allegedly took out a baseball bat from the vehicle and struck the front windshield of the complainant's car.

Further, it is alleged that when crowd gathered at the spot, the accused persons, taking advantage of the situation, forcibly removed a gold bracelet (kada) weighing approximately four tolas from the complainant's right wrist and also snatched his gold chain weighing four tolas from his neck.

(iii) Learned counsel for the petitioner submitqs that even if the entire prosecution version is accepted as true, no offence under Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) is made out. It is further argued that none of the accused persons, including the petitioner, actually used any firearm, as no shot was fired despite the alleged availability of weapons. Had there been any real intention to kill, the accused would have discharged the firearms.

It is also contended that complainant sustained only three injuries, all of which are simple in nature, thereby negating the allegation of any intention to commit a fatal assault. Counsel submits that due to prior enmity, a false and exaggerated version has been concocted to falsely implicate the petitioner and other co-accused.

(iv) Lastly, it is submitted that petitioner is willing to join the investigation and fully cooperate with the authorities, provided he is granted protection from arrest. Thus, a prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

(v) Notice of motion.

(vi) On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with Mr. Harkirat Singh Randhawa, Advocate, put in appearance on behalf of the complainant, and files his vakalatnama in Court today, which is taken on record.

(vii) Learned Senior Counsel for the complainant submits that complainant had been receiving repeated threats demanding ransom. It is contended that the

**CRM-M-20765-2026**

motive behind the incident was to further intimidate and terrorize the complainant and his family members.

In this regard, it is specifically pointed out that on the very date of the incident, i.e., 24.02.2026, an amount of Rs. 2 lakhs was transferred by Manpreet Kaur (sister-in-law of the complainant) into the account of the petitioner. It is alleged that the said amount constituted contract money. Manpreet Kaur is stated to be involved in ongoing matrimonial litigation in Australia with her husband, who is the brother of the complainant.

(viii) Adjourned to 11.05.2026, to enable learned State counsel to file status report in the matter.

(ix) Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

(x) Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Teja Singh submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation on 02.05.2026, and as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 17.04.2026 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

5. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.



CRM-M-20765-2026

6. However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

7. It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

11.05.2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

YES/~~NO~~
~~YES~~/NO