

2026:PHHC:044910



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.58936 of 2025

Gurmandeep Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	19.03.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	23.03.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	23.03.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking



regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
207	19.12.2024	Khalra, District Tarn Taran	109 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 (238 of BNS added later on)

2. As per the allegations, on 19.12.2024, the complainant Harish Kumar Dhawan was present in the house of his friend Akashdeep Singh when he was called by someone. On going outside, he found Gurmandeep Singh @ Raja i.e. the present petitioner to be standing there. He told the complainant that Sukhdev Singh, Sarpanch of Village Khalra was calling him. On being so informed, the complainant along with the petitioner went towards the turn of the street where two youths were found standing on a motor bike with Sarpanch Sukhdev Singh. When the complainant resisted, Sukhdev Singh proclaimed that the complainant should be made to sit on the bike. Then on the asking of Sukhdev Singh, shot was fired with some firearm upon him by the petitioner that hit his left knee. He started bleeding and raised alarm. The petitioner again tried to fire a shot but the same was missed. In the meanwhile, his family members and others reached at the spot and raised clamour, on hearing which the assailants fled away.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Sukhdev Singh, Sarpanch was declared to be innocent during the course of investigation. The petitioner was arrested on 09.06.2025. He

suffered disclosure statement saying that he was a drug addict and asked the

2026:PHHC:044910



complainant to lend him some money who in turn had abused him and feeling offended, he had called the complainant on 19.12.2024 and along with his friend Kirpal Singh and another youth had fired shots at the victim. On the basis of his statement, Kirpal Singh was nominated as additional accused. He was arrested and suffered disclosure statement on the basis of which Amritpal Singh was nominated as additional accused. He was arrested on 14.06.2025. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been in custody since 09.06.2025. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Sukhdev Singh who was alleged to be the main culprit was declared innocent. His antecedents are clean. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. The injury sustained by the victim has been opined to be simple in nature. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is in custody since 09.06.2025. He is not required for further investigation. No fruitful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. Taking into consideration his antecedents, the period of his incarceration and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

2026:PHHC:044910



Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.03.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No