



243

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

CRM-M-27049-2026

Date of decision : 18.05.2026

Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in cross-case recorded vide DDR No.31 dated 05.02.2025, under Sections 103, 190, 191(3) of BNS and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959 in FIR No.11 dated 05.02.2025, under Sections 125, 351(2) of BNS (Section 109 of BNS added later on) and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Phool, District Bathinda.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the DDR has been registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ravpreet Kaur wife of Overseer Singh. It was alleged that on 05.02.2025 at about 02:00 A.M., complainant's husband Overseer Singh alias Satnam Singh alias Satti alongwith his two friends went to Gumti Road in front of the house of Gurtej Chand, where they indulged into heated arguments with Gurtej Chand and others and both the parties fired gun shots at each other. It was alleged that Gurtej Chand and his companions, namely, Lavi Sharma,



Jaskaran Singh alias Jassa and Gopi (present petitioner) with two unidentified persons fired gunshots upon her husband. It was alleged that one such shot hit on his right arm and another shot hit upon his left shoulder. It was alleged that he was taken to the Civil Hospital, Bathinda for treatment, however, he succumbed to his injuries. It was alleged that the motive behind the occurrence was that a fight took place between Overseer Singh alias Satnam Singh alias Satti and Gurtej Chand about 1.5 years back and due to the said fight, Gurtej Chand used to keep grudge against complainant's husband. On the basis of above said statement, a cross version bearing GD No.31 dated 05.02.2025 was entered in the FIR No.11 dated 05.02.2025. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of DDR, investigation commenced. Resultantly, petitioner was arrested on 25.02.2025. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda, 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 vide order dated 20.12.2025. Being aggrieved, petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of co-accused, namely, Lovejeet Sharma @ Labhi. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order passed by this Court in CRM-M-54077-2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Lovejeet Sharma @ Labhi has been granted the concession of regular bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court. He has further submitted that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves



to be granted bail. He has also submitted that the petitioner is behind the bars from last more than 01 year.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. However, he has endorsed the fact that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Lovejeet Sharma @ Labhi, who has already been granted bail by this Court. On instructions, he has submitted that challan has been presented and charges have been framed. He has produced custody certificate of petitioner, today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest. The custody certificate produced would show that petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 02 months and 28 days as on 16.05.2026. It further reflects that though the petitioner is involved in 10 more cases, however, in 04 cases, he is on bail; in 01 case, he has been acquitted; in 01 case, he has been discharged. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Lovejeet Sharma @ Labhi has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 05.05.2026 passed in CRM-M-54077-2025.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after 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 sufficiently long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and 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 on the basis of parity with co-accused, Lovejeet Sharma @

Labhi who has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 05.05.2026. 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. If the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

18.05.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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