



CRM-M-56345-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

141

CRM-M-56345-2025
Decided on : 24.03.2026

Gurmeet Singh alias Gurmeet Singh Jhansal and another
... Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab
... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate and
Mr. J.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG 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
(i) Gurmeet Singh @ Gurmeet Singh Jhansal, aged 21 years (ii) Mandeep Singh, aged 18 years	184	24.07.2025	Sections 109, 304(2), 115(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959	Canal Colony, Bathinda	Bathinda

2. Incident in the present case took place on 21.07.2025 at about 9.00 p.m. and the FIR in the present case was got registered at the instance of complainant-Avi @ Goli naming therein total five accused (i) Gurmeet Singh,

**CRM-M-56345-2025**

aged 21 years and (ii) Mandeep Singh, aged 18 years (petitioners herein), (iii) Happy Tiwant (iv) Bunty @ Vinay (v) Jaskaran Fauji. As per case of the prosecution there is a single fire shot by accused-Bunty @ Vinay, which caused injury on the ankle of injured Avi @ Goli.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that apart this there is a common and anonymous allegation that injured was given dang/stick blows, however, no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioners herein. It is also argued that complainant himself was involved in several other criminal cases, which have detailed in paragraph No. 4 of the petition. There are total 21 prosecution witnesses and none has been examined till date, whereas due to the slow pace of the trial petitioners, who are at the prime age of their life, are lying inside jail for the last more than a period of 08 months, without there being any specific injury attributed to them by the injured-complainant in the incident.

4. The factual aspects as argued by counsel for the petitioner including the involvement of injured himself in several other criminal cases has not been disputed by learned State counsel. Without there being any assistance from any Investigating Officer, learned State counsel is not in a position to controvert the argument that complainant himself was facing many other cases.

I have noticed all such cases, which have been detailed in paragraph No. 4 and for referenced reproduce here under:

- i. FIR No. 0056 dated 28.04.2024, under Section 308,341,323,427,148,149 of IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda.*
- ii. FIR No. 0182 dated 23.07.2025, under Section 109, 331(6), 118(1), 115(2), 324(4), 351(1), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Canal Colony Bathinda, District Bathinda.*

**CRM-M-56345-2025**

iii. FIR No. 0055 dated 31.03.2022, under Section 307,324,323,427,341,148,149 of IPC, registered at Police Station Kotwali Bathinda, District Bathinda.

iv. FIR No. 0129 dated 24.07.2022, under Section 160 of IPC, registered at Police Station Kotwali Bathinda, District Bathinda.

v. FIR No. 0100 dated 18.04.2023, under Section 395 of IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda, and District Bathinda.

5. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available before it.

6. In view of the aforementioned circumstances and noticing that both the petitioners are only aged 21 years and 18 years and have not been attributed any specific injury to the injured Avi @ Goli, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail of the petitioners.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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 petitioners 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, petitioners are directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands disposed of.



CRM-M-56345-2025

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

March 24, 2026

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

reena

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