



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

120

**CRM-M-55513-2025 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 22.04.2026.**

Gurpreet Singh

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Swarn Sandhir, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-Gurpreet Singh, aged 24 years, has filed this petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.58 dated 07.08.2021 under Sections 379-B, 324, 326, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Balianwali, District Bathinda.

2. On the statement of complainant-Palwinder Singh, FIR in the present case was registered against four unknown persons and version of FIR reads as under:-

“xxx Stated that I am resident of the above said address and working in Bharat Finance Company Maharaj Basti Rampura Phul for above 2 years as Sangam Manager but our job is to form committees in the village (forming small groups) of women and provide loans to the group of women. Which we collect through weekly instalments. That on 05.08.2021, myself

on a motorcycle number PB-03-H-6272 make deluxe colour black and red went to village Bunder at around 7.30 in the morning to collect the payments from the groups from their home and centers and collected different instalments of Rs. 1500/-, Rs. 1000/- from one member and Rs. 50,000/- from centers, which totaled around Rs.1,50,000/-. That amount I put in my black kit and other documents of the company were also put in the kit, then at about 3.30 PM (afternoon) along with Manjot Singh alias Jot son of Sadagar Singh resident of Bhunder as helper of Manjit Singh alias Jot and Manjot Singh alias Jot was driving the motorcycle number PB 03 H 6272 and I was holding kit behind the motorcycle. When we were going to village Bhundar on the paved road to Rampura Phul, about one kilometer away from Bhundar village. Then unknown person riding the motorcycle behind us came and hit the motorcycle and both of them fell down there and the unknown person riding the other motorcycle who had his face muffled hit my kit with a sharp weapon held by his side and punched me and pulled the kit of payment and that hit me on my back through the kit. I stopped the motorcycle there for my own protection and started to throw a brick at them. Then they gave injuries on my right hand with sharp. weapon and due to which I had a cut on my right hand. We made a lot of noise so the four unknown person snatched the money kit and left themselves on their motorbikes showing us pistols and threatening us. One out of them went towards Bhundar side and the other ran away on motorcycle towards Rampura side. Thereafter Manjot Singh arranged a vehicle and got me admitted at Apex Hospital Rampura. The said motorcyclist, unknown person, took the money kit containing about Rs.1,50,000/- and other documents from me by giving injuries. Doctors of Apex hospital gave me first aid and referred me to higher hospital. I am admitted to Max Hospital and I am getting my treatment. Appropriate legal action may please be taken against the unknown persons.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the incident in question took place at 3:30 PM on 05.08.2021, while the complainant was on his motorcycle No.PB-03h-6272. The FIR was got registered after a period of two days on 07.08.2021.

First time, when the prosecution agency was not able to trace out the actual culprits, taking help of supplementary statement of the complainant, after a period of 38 days, it was recorded that on the basis of the personal enquiry conducted by the complainant, he came to know about the names of the accused as (1) Jaskaran Singh @ Lovely, (2) Jagtar Singh @ Tari, (3) Harpreet Singh and (4) Gurpreet Singh. Counsel argues that case has been falsely planted against the accused only in a situation when the Investigating Officer was not able to trace out the actual culprits. Counsel further argues that all other three accused namely Jagtar Singh @ Tari, Harpreet Singh and Jaskaran Singh @ Lovely have already been granted bail by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 30.08.2024 passed in CRM-M-23983-2024, order dated 28.04.2025 passed in CRM-M-19934-2025 and order dated 31.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-30267-2025 respectively. Copy of the said orders have been produced in Court today, which are taken on record. Thus, counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 21.04.2026. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper book.

Learned State counsel opposed the bail on the ground that keeping in view the nature of offence committed by the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsel.

6. There being no specific allegations, causing any differentiation from the case of the other co-accused and also by noticing that petitioner is inside jail for the last more than 01 year and 05 months i.e. since 12.11.2024 and till date process of recording statements of the prosecution witnesses has not even started, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail to the petitioner as further incarceration of the petitioner inside the jail without proving of charges would be improper.

Considering the above said circumstances in totality, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Consequently, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular 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.

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

8. 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.

9. 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.
10. **Petition stands disposed of accordingly.**
Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

22.04.2026
jitender

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