



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at  
Chandigarh**

**109**

CRM-M-29127-2026 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 21.05.2026

Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present:- Mr. Gazi Mohd. Umair, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUBHAS MEHLA, J.** (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 (438 of Cr.P.C.), has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.46 dated 31.03.2026, registered under Sections 109, 324(4), 61(2), 190 and 191(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNS') and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Shri Hargobindpur, Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Petitioner - Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi was nominated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statements made by co-accused Ladi Singh and Jaspreet Singh. Briefly, allegations against the petitioner are that he being a member of unlawful assembly, actively participated in the commission of offence and trespassed the house of complainant along with other co-accused armed with sharp edged weapons and fire arms and attacked on complainant party.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the following grounds:

- i. Petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in the present case under political pressure.
- ii. It is a no injury case.
- iii. That the petitioner was not present at the spot.
- iv. The petitioner has been nominated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which is inadmissible in law.
- v. Nothing is to be recovered from his possession.
- vi. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of the respondent-State and opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the following grounds:

- i. That the petitioner was a member of unlawful assembly, which attacked the house of the complainant and also damaged a motorcycle and fired gun shots.
- ii. Attack was done at the behest of co-accused, who is in live-in-relationship with daughter-in-law of the complainant.
- iii. Empties were collected from the spot and investigation is on-going.
- iv. That the petitioner is having criminal antecedents and involved in other criminal activities.



v. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the true facts of the case and for proper investigation in the matter.

5. Heard.

6. After considering the rival submissions of learned counsel for the parties and the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds no merit in the present petition on the following grounds:

i. The role assigned to the petitioner that he is a member of unlawful assembly, which was armed with firearms and deadly weapons and attacked the house of the complainant including damaging a motorcycle and also firing gun shots.

ii. Empties were collected from the spot and investigation is still on-going.

iii. That the petitioner is having criminal antecedents and involved in other criminal activities.

iv. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the true facts of the case and for proper investigation of the case.

7 Considering the seriousness of the offence and the manner in which offence has been committed, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as anticipatory bail is a discretionary relief, which can be granted only in extra-ordinary circumstances, only when it would not impede investigation or progress of the case.



8           Hon’ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as ‘**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 63806’ decided on 03.08.1997**, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9           In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

10          Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

**21.05.2026**  
Geeta

**( SUBHAS MEHLA )**  
**JUDGE**

|                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Whether speaking /reasoned | Yes / No |
| Whether Reportable         | Yes / No |