



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-27053-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.05.2026

Gurjeet Singh @ Jiti

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

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

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG Haryana and
ASI Bhupinder Singh, No.113/FTB, P.S. Jakhal, Fatehabad.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.106 dated 11.08.2025 registered under Sections 103(1), 140(1), 190, 191(3) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Jakhal, District Fatehabad (Haryana).
2. The present FIR was registered on the complaint of Happy Singh son of Sukhdev Singh, alleging therein that his uncle namely Bhola Singh had two sons namely Kulwinder Singh and Aakashdeep Singh and both were married. During the intervening night of 03/04.08.2025, a quarrel took place between Aakashdeep Singh and his friends and proceedings under Sections 126/170 BNSS, 2023 were undertaken. On 10.08.2025, both sides departed village Mussa Khera for negotiating compromise and Aakashdeep Singh was accompanied by his friend Anmol, son of Mithu Singh. At that time, at about 05:45 p.m., Happy Singh came to know that

Bittu, son of Jasbir, Raman son of Makhan Singh, Manjeet alias Bagdadi alias Nimbu son of Harpal, Sikandar son of Rupa Singh, had abducted Aakashdeep Singh in their 'Ritz' car. To commit his murder, they took him to one house situated in village Rupawali and gave beatings to Aakashdeep Singh with lathis, dandas and iron rods. Akashdeep Singh was also beaten up by female family members of that house and thereafter he was taken on a round in the village. On seeing him, Jagsir son of Wazir Chand and Milkha Singh son of Ranjeet Singh, the accused persons fled away from there along with their weapons in 'Ritz' car after throwing Aakashdeep Singh on Rupawali to Ghaswa Road. Aakashdeep Singh was shifted to Government Hospital, Ratia from where, after giving first-aid, he was referred to MAMC, Agroha but he died in Government Hospital, Ratia itself. Bittu, Raman, Manjeet alias Bagdadi alias Nimbu, Sikandar and his friends namely Avtar Singh alias Tari, Gurjeet Singh alias Jiti (petitioner) and other accused, in prosecution of their common object, brutally beat up Aakashdeep Singh with dandas and iron rod resulting in injuries to his legs, chest, back and head. Somjit alias Somi and Krishan Singh Pandit were also involved in the murder of Aakashdeep Singh. On the statement of Happy Singh, F.I.R. No. 0106 dated 11.08.2025 under sections 103 (1), 140 (1), 190, 191 (3), 61 (2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 was registered at Police Station Jakhal, District Fatehabad (Haryana).

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence and that as per the footage of CCTV cameras installed at his house, he was present there at 5.45 p.m. He contends that prior thereto, he had gone to his in-laws and was

on his way, hence, he could not have been present at the place of occurrence. He contends that there is no specific attribution to the petitioner in the FIR and that his name came up in the disclosure of a co-accused whereas four other co-accused have not disclosed his name. It is thus submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. The petitioner had no motive to indulge himself in the offence in question.

4. Reply by way of affidavit dated 19.05.2026 of Mr. Jai Bhagwan, HPS, Dy. Superintendent of Police, Tohana, District Fatehabad, on behalf of respondent-State has been filed by the learned State counsel today in the Court and the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel contends that the arguments advanced by the counsel for the petitioner are devoid of merits inasmuch as complainant-Happy Singh son of Sukhdev Singh i.e. cousin of deceased/Akashdeep Singh received the information at about 5.45 p.m. and it is not that the incident in question took place at 5.45 p.m. She contends that the petitioner himself claims to have entered the house at around 5.45 p.m. In such an eventuality, his presence at the place of occurrence is not improbable. She contends that the name of the petitioner specifically cropped up in the complaint submitted by the complainant and he has been attributed lathi blows similar to other co-accused. It is further contended that there are as many as 14 injuries on the person of deceased/Akashdeep Singh which are lacerated wounds on the vital parts of the body including skull and other places. Such a large number of injuries could not have been caused by one person. There are multiple fractures on the person of the deceased as a result

of the impact of the injuries. She further contends that as per the disclosure of co-accused/Manjeet @ Baghdadi @ Nimbu, there was an old enmity with deceased/Akashdeep Singh and that the petitioner being his friend, had accompanied said co-accused/Manjeet @ Baghdadi @ Nimbu. She also contends that the petitioner is a history-sheeter and is involved in six other criminal cases. The details thereof are as under:-

- “a. FIR No. 11 dated 20.01.2018 under Sections 458/323/148/149 IPC, Police Station Dirba, Punjab.*
- b. FIR No. 349 dated 24.10.2022 under Sections 323/341/34 IPC, Police Station Sadar Ratia which is pending under trial.*
- c. FIR No. 184 dated 13.07.2023 under Sections 147/149/323/452/506 IPC, Police Station Sadar Ratia which is pending under trial.*
- d. FIR No. 194 dated 29.11.2023 under Sections 323/341/427/506/34 IPC Police Station Jakhal which is pending under trial*
- e. FIR No. 08 dated 08.01.2024 under Sections 25/54/59 Arms Act, Police Station Sadar Ratia which is pending under trial.*
- f. FIR No. 79 dated 01.05.2025 under Sections 25/54/59 Arms Act, Police Station Sadar Ratia which is pending under trial.”*

6. Learned State counsel further contends that complainant-Happy Singh reached at the place of occurrence, after the injuries had already been caused; hence, his version is a truthful account and that he nominated the accused but would actually not be in a position to attribute specific role and injuries to respective assailants and the benefit thereof cannot be claimed by the petitioner.

7. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended with the

instant petition with their able assistance.

8. Considering that the arguments as sought to be advanced by the counsel for the petitioner cannot be examined at this stage as the same are part of the evidence yet to be collected and verified and also noticing that there is sufficient *prima facie* evidence. The petitioner alongwith other co-accused gave beatings to deceased resulting in 14 injuries, all over the body, as per MLR. The petitioner cannot claim benefit of doubt at this stage as his version is yet to be investigated into. While considering bail, investigation is not to be minutely scrutinized. The nature of offence, the attribution in the first version and criminal antecedents of petitioner render his version lacking force and merit. The name of the petitioner having been given by the complainant in the FIR and corroborated by the disclosure made by the co-accused and also taking into consideration the history of the petitioner of being regularly involved in multiple criminal cases, this Court is not inclined to extend any indulgence of anticipatory bail. The petition is accordingly **dismissed**.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

20.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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