



223

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.52823 of 2025

Jobanjit Singh @ Jobi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CRM-M No.73655 of 2025

Amritpal Singh @ Amrit Singh @ Gandhi

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

Date of Decision: 16.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-52823-2025.

Mr. Karamjit Singh Maangat, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-73655-2025 (through VC).

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. By this order, I dispose of the above mentioned two petitions arising out of the same FIR.
2. Both the petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.17, dated 08.03.2025, under Sections 103(1), 3(5) BNS, 2023 & Section 25 of Arms Act (Sections



61(2), 249, 238, 109, 111 of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Mehta, District Amritsar Rural.

3. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Dalbir Singh. It was alleged that son of the complainant, namely, Gursewak Singh (deceased) was of the age of 13 years and he was a football player. On 08.03.2025, at about 2:00/2:30 p.m., he took his son to Government School ground in village Khabbe Rajputa to play football match. The team of his son secured second position in the tournament and after the prize distribution, the members of the team were taking photo with the trophy. At about 07:15 p.m., two unknown persons arrived on motorcycle and then, the pillion rider fired on Gurpreet Singh @ Jaanu. He again fired and the same hit on the back of his son Gursewak Singh. He fell down in front of him. Due to sudden commotion on the spot, the assailants escaped on their motorcycle. His son Gursewak Singh and Gurpreet Singh @ Jaanu were shifted to Civil Hospital, where, his son succumbed to the injuries. The request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioners was established and thus, they were arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioners were arrested on 18.03.2025. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, dismissed the bail applications filed by the petitioners vide order dated 28.08.2025. Hence, the petitioners have approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the



present petitions.

4. Learned counsels for the petitioners have contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. They have submitted that though the FIR is for the offence under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act for the murder of Gursewak Singh, however the allegations against the petitioners are regarding the harboring of one Kulbir Singh.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner in CRM-M-52823-2025 has submitted that Kulbir Singh is the cousin of Jobanjit Singh @ Jobi (petitioner in CRM-M-52823-2025) and allegations against the petitioners are after the commission of the offence, which they were not aware of.

6. To buttress their arguments, learned counsels for the petitioners have submitted that the petitioners have been charge sheeted by the learned trial Court only for the offence under Section 249 BNS. They have submitted that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents as they have never been involved in any other case. They have submitted that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest, i.e. 18.03.2025, however, there is no material progress in the trial. They have submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

7. Status report dated 15.02.2026 (in CRM-M-52823-2025) by way of an affidavit of Ravinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Jandiala, Amritsar (Rural) on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court, which is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to counsel for petitioner.



8. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that complicity of the petitioners has been established after the commission of the offence. He has submitted that they have harbored the co-accused. He has submitted that the co-accused, who have fired at the deceased, are yet to be arrested. He has submitted that out of total 45 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

9. Heard.

10. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the charges against the petitioners have been framed for the offence under Section 249 of BNS only. The petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest, i.e. 18.03.2025. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioners have suffered an incarceration of 10 months & 22 days as on 14.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioners are not involved in any other case.

11. 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. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsels for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

12. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed and the petitioners,



namely, Jobanjit Singh @ Jobi and Amritpal Singh @ Amik Singh @ Gandhi are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

13. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

16.02.2026
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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