



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

CRM-M-47542-2025
Decided on : 05.03.2026

Gurkirat Singh @ Goga . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. J.K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant third petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurkirat Singh @ Goga	03	04.01.2024	307, 324, 323, 148, 149 of IPC, 1860 and 25 of Arms Act, 1959 [Later on, offence u/s 326 & 325 of IPC, were added vide DDR No.30, dated 16.01.2024, and offence u/s 201 of IPC added vide DDR No.38, dated 25.04.2025, and offence u/s 341 of IPC was also added later on vide DDR No.41, dated 29.06.2025] [Offences u/s 120-B of IPC and offence u/s 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act, have been deleted vide DDR No.37, dated 17.06.2024]	Boha	Mansa

2. Complainant – Baldev Singh got FIR in present case registered by stating that while he along with injured Hardeep Singh and Gurpreet



Singh was travelling in his i20 car bearing registration No. PB-23E-8183, they were stopped on way and thereafter accused persons, namely (i) Gurkirat Singh @ Goga (petitioner herein), (ii) Surinder Singh @ Shinda, (iii) Jagsir Singh @ Jaggi, (iv) Manwinder Singh, (v) Jaspreet Singh and (vi) Harpreet Singh @ Happy, who were armed with weapons, pulled them out of car and caused injuries to them.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 24.04.2025. As per allegations, petitioner has been attributed a sword blow on the back side of head of the complainant – Baldev Singh, which has been declared simple in nature. Another injury attributed to petitioner is on left shoulder of injured – Gurpreet Singh with kirpan; however, said injury has been declared grievous in nature.

It is argued that none of injuries attributed to petitioner were caused on any vital part of body. Moreover, all three injured eye-witnesses have already been examined before trial Court. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping petitioner in further custody. Thus, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to petitioner.

4. On other hand, learned State counsel has produced custody certificate dated 03.03.2026 in Court today. Same is taken on record. Office is directed to tag same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been supplied to counsel for petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel, while referring to status report dated 23.10.2025, submits that there were three injured persons. Injured No.1 – complainant Baldev Singh suffered three injuries, all of which were declared simple in nature.



Injured No.2 – Gurpreet Singh also suffered three injuries; one injury on shoulder, attributed to petitioner, has been declared grievous in nature, whereas another injury was attributed to co-accused Jagsir Singh @ Jaggi, who has already been granted regular bail by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 15.07.2024 passed in CRM-M-21924-2024, titled, *“Jagsir Singh @ Jaggi v. State of Punjab”* (Annexure P-7). Third injury was declared simple in nature.

Injured No.3 – Hardeep Singh also suffered three injuries, out of which injury No.2 on nose was declared grievous in nature and was attributed to co-accused Jagsir Singh @ Jaggi (already on bail).

6. Learned State counsel further submits that petitioner is involved in four other criminal cases and, therefore, he opposes grant of regular bail to petitioner. However, as per status report, it remains undisputed that in FIR No.007 dated 12.01.2012 under Sections 341, 323, 34 IPC registered at Police Station Boha, petitioner already stands acquitted vide judgment dated 16.08.2012.

It is further fairly conceded that remaining three cases are still pending and petitioner has not been convicted in any of them so far, as they are presently under trial.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

8. Considering submissions made by learned counsel for parties and material available on record, it is evident that though petitioner has been attributed injuries to two of the injured persons, however, injury attributed to complainant – Baldev Singh has been declared simple in nature. So far as



injury attributed to injured – Gurpreet Singh is concerned, though it has been declared grievous in nature, same has been stated to be on the shoulder and not on any vital part of the body.

It is also noticeable that all the three injured eye-witnesses, namely Baldev Singh, Gurpreet Singh and Hardeep Singh, have already been examined before the trial Court. Therefore, possibility of petitioner influencing or tampering with their testimony stands considerably diminished.

9. It is further not disputed that co-accused Jagsir Singh @ Jaggi, who has also been attributed one of the grievous injuries to injured – Hardeep Singh, has already been granted concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 15.07.2024. Besides, petitioner is in custody since 24.04.2025 and trial is still at an initial stage. Though petitioner is stated to be involved in other criminal cases, it remains undisputed that in one case he already stands acquitted and in remaining cases trial is still pending.

Thus, keeping in view totality of circumstances and without commenting upon merits of the case lest it may prejudice either side during trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant concession of regular bail to petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.



10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 05, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No