



CRM-M-54788-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

136

CRM-M-54788-2025
Decided on : 16.03.2026

Gurinder Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Vishal Sharma (Vasudeva), Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh Gill, Addl. A.G., Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant 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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurinder Singh, aged 41 years	84	21.06.2024	302 IPC and Section 27-54-59 of Arms Act	Mullanpur	SAS Nagar, Punjab

2. Affidavit of Sh. Harsimrat Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division, Mullanpur, District SAS Nagar (Mohali) alongwith Pen Drive (CCTV Footage) on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed in the Court today. The same is taken on record.

3. Petitioner-Gurinder Singh has been involved in the case with the



allegation that on 18.06.2024/19.06.2024, deceased-Manvir Singh had gone to the Bank where some dispute arose and petitioner Gurinder Singh, who was a security guard fired shot with his gun at Manvir Singh in his abdomen who got injured and then died in PGI Chandigarh.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that even if allegations are taken to be true there was no prior motive, as it is not even alleged by the complainant in the FIR. After completion of investigation challan has already been presented, however, conclusion of trial is likely to consume considerable period. Taking help of the CCTV Footage, counsel argues that petitioner was posted as Security guard in the Bank was aggressively intimidated and caught hold from his neck with an attempt to snatch his firearm. So prima facie, act done by the petitioner falls in the exceptions of the offences as it has been done in self defence. There is a cross version also with the Investigating agency but same has not been properly investigated. Merely for final issue requiring adjudication, continued incarceration of petitioner would not serve any meaningful purpose, thus, prays for grant of bail.

5. Learned State counsel argues that petitioner has since caused murder with his licensed gun, merely with a plea of act done in self defence won't justify the release of petitioner on bail.

6. I have considered the submissions addressed by respective counsel for the parties. The petitioner is inside jail for the last more than a period of 01 year 08 months and 17 days and not even a single witness has been examined till date. Even if the plea addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner is discarded that he became apprehensive of his life, there appears to be alternative plea available with the petitioner i.e. happening of incident due to provocation on spur of moment,

**CRM-M-54788-2025****3**

however, all this is to be ascertained by the Court below after adducing of complete evidence before it. Presently, examining the totality of circumstances under which the incident might have taken place and the fact that there was no pre-meditative act, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. 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/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

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

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

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

March 16, 2026*reena*

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE