



CRM-M-22388-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-22388-2025

Date of Decision: 23.04.2026

Gurpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.K.D.Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.103 dated 04.11.2024, registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 118(1), 333, 304 (2) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Lambran, Jalandhar Rural, District Jalandhar.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Amandeep Kaur. It was alleged that she is working in Bubble West One Factory. She had obtained divorce from her husband and was residing at her parental home with her mother, Kulwinder Kaur. Her father Surinder Singh has also passed away. Her mother Kulwinder Kaur was also working along with her in the above said factory. It was alleged that her youngest sister Rajvir Kaur was married with Gurpreet Singh (petitioner) from 2½ years back and after the marriage, they were not on talking terms with them. It has been further alleged that on 01.11.2024, she along with her mother were present at their house at village Ali Chak, then at about 10:30 pm, she received a call on her mobile phone from Baljit Kaur sister of Gurpreet Singh, who told her that Gurpreet Singh was under influence of drugs and he was coming to their house with intention to kill them. When complainant was informing her mother about



the same then, in the meantime, Gurpreet Singh, armed with a kirpan, forcibly entered into their house while threatening to kill them. Thereafter, he gave 9 blows of *kirpan*. When her mother came forward to rescue her, then Gurpreet Singh gave 4 blows of *kirpan*, which hit Kulwinder Kaur. Thereafter, both of them raised alarm and on hearing the same, Gurpreet Singh ran away from the spot by snatching her earrings and her mobile phone. 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 and the petitioner was arrested on 05.11.2024. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar 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 01.02.2025. 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 submits that as alleged there are two injured in the present case i.e. Amandeep Kaur (sister-in-law of the petitioner) and Kulwinder Kaur (mother-in-law of the petitioner). He submits that as the petitioner had performed love marriage with the daughter of Kulwinder Kaur, the complainant had nurtured grudge against the petitioner and thus, implicated him in the present case. He submits that examination-in-chief of both said injured had already been conducted, but they are intentionally avoiding their presence for their cross-examination before the trial Court only to prolong



the incarceration of the petitioner. To buttress his arguments, he submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he is behind the bars from the last about 1½ years. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner caused nine injuries to Amandeep Kaur and four injuries to Kulwinder Kaur. He contends that only examination-in-chief of the injured has been conducted, whereas, their cross-examination is yet to be conducted. On instructions, he submits that out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, 02 witnesses have been partially examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the injured and the petitioner are related to each other. Examination-in-chief of the injured has been conducted, however, for carrying out their cross-examination, bailable warrants have been issued against them as reflected from the zimini order dated 07.04.2026. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 05 months & 14 days as on 22.04.2026. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Out of 15 prosecution witnesses, 02 witnesses have been partially examined.

6. 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



CRM-M-22388-2025

-4-

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.

7. 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.

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

23.04.2026
sharmila

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