



CRM-M-58058-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

121

CRM-M-58058-2025
Decided on : 21.04.2026

Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Rahul Kadian, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. 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
Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, aged 25 years	111	29.06.2024	302, 307, 379-B, 332, 333, 186, 353, 342, 148, 149 and 201 IPC, Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act	Dharamkot	Moga

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the shots were fired by the main assailants, namely Harpreet Singh @ Happy and Dharampreet Singh @ Dharma, who are yet to be arrested. The petitioner–Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi son of Buta Singh was involved only on the basis of disclosure statement of another accused Dharampreet Singh @ Dharma, although nothing material could be

**CRM-M-58058-2025**

recovered when the petitioner was arrested as accused in the present case, therefore, the involvement of the accused as planted by the prosecution, that too on the strength of disclosure statement can not sustain, because of issue of inadmissibility of such an evidence.

Another co-accused, whose name was also involved on the basis of disclosure statement namely Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi S/o Jarnail Singh has already been granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 16.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-73526-2025. Counsel further submits that similarly situated co-accused, Paramjit Kaur, was also granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 09.10.2025 in CRM-M-27837-2025. Even Manjit Kaur and Malkiat Singh, whose names were also involved on the basis of disclosure statements have also been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 26.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-16095-2025 and vide order dated 26.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-34575-2025 (Annexures P-4 and P-5). Counsel further submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 03.07.2024 (01 year, 09 months and 15 days) and out of total 34 prosecution witnesses till date none has been examined. On these grounds, the petitioner prays for the grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail, submitting that the petitioner is involved in a serious offence. Learned State counsel also expresses concern that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may try to influence witnesses or interfere with the trial. However, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that a similarly placed co-accused, Paramjit Kaur, Manjit Kaur and Malkiat Singh have already been granted bail. Even so, the State prays for dismissal of the present petition.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material



CRM-M-58058-2025

available on record. It is observed that the petitioner's alleged involvement arises solely from a disclosure statement, which is not admissible as substantive evidence in the eyes of law. Further, considering that the petitioner has been in custody for more than a period of 01 year, 09 months and 15 days, and in light of the parity with the similarly situated co-accused, this Court is of the view that the matter warrants consideration for grant of regular bail.

This Court is also of the view that petitioner deserves an opportunity to rehabilitate and reintegrate into society. Thus, without making any comments or observations on the quality/standard of the evidence collected by the prosecution, primarily considering the long incarceration and non-examination of the material witnesses, to the view point of this Court, personal liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period.

5. Considering the aspects and circumstances, 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.

6. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

7. It is further made clear that if in future petitioner is found indulged in similar kind of activities, prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in the present case.

8. Petition stands disposed of.



CRM-M-58058-2025

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stands disposed of accordingly.

April 21, 2026

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

reena

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