

2026:PHHC:016529



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-69805-2025
Date of decision: 04.02.2026

GURPREET SINGH ALIAS GOPIPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Aayush Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 0130 dated 29.11.2024, registered under Section(s) 109, 115(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Phool, District Bathinda.

2. The present FIR was registered on the statement of Rupinder Singh @ Motu, the same reads as under:-

“.....stated that he is a resident of the above address and does manual labour work. On 26.11.2024, there was a wedding at the house of Satvir Singh, son of Roop Singh, resident of Selbrah, which he went to attend. Around 5:30 PM, as he was

sitting outside Satvir Singh's house, a white Scorpio car, with "Faridkotia" written on the front window and an unknown number, passed by. A short distance away, a bike also arrived. Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, son of Sukhdev Singh, resident of Selbrah, got out of the car with a pistol in his hand. He put the pistol to the complainant's chest and slapped him. At that moment, Shagani, son of unknown, resident of Dhapali, got out of the car with a sharp iron weapon like a khanda (sword). As soon as he got out, he intentionally hit the back of the complainant's head with the weapon to kill him, which struck his head and made him fall down. When Shagana was about to strike a second blow the complainant moved aside, and the sword-like weapon hit the ground and broke. Then Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi took out an iron rod from the car and tried to hit the complainant's head while he was lying down. The complainant put both his hands forward in defense, and the iron rod struck both his right and left hands. Then Shagani Singh took the rod from Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi and also struck towards the complainant's head, but the complainant put his right arm forward in defense, and the rod struck his right arm. Then Shagani hit the complainant's right leg two or three times with the iron rod. Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi held the complainant's left leg and started hitting it with bricks. Shagani Singh also hit the left leg with the iron rod. Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi and Shagani Singh had a girl named Sukh Kaur, daughter of Baldev Singh, resident of Phul, sitting in the car, video record the entire assault on her phone. There was one more unknown person with them in the car who did not get out. When the complainant shouted for help Marta Marta all four of them fled the scene in the car with their weapons. They all assaulted him with the intention of killing him. The reason for the animosity is that a long time ago, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi was beaten up in jail, and he suspected the complainant was responsible for it. After that, the complainant's father, Boota

Singh, arrived and arranged transport to Civil Hospital Rampura, where he was admitted. From there, he was referred to AIIMS Hospital Bathinda, where he is currently undergoing treatment. Legal action should be taken against Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, Shagani Singh, Sukh Kaur, and the unknown person.”

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and no specific role has been attributed to him. He contends that the injury attracted under Section 109 of BNS is attributed to co-accused Shagani Singh. The said co-accused is still absconding. Further, during the course of investigation, the attribution made to the petitioner, was an iron rod blow on the hands and leg of the victim, which are on non-vital body parts and at best would attract Section 118(1) of the BNS, 2023. He contends that the petitioner is in custody since 25.02.2025 and has already undergone an actual custody of more than 11 months. No witness, out of a total of 22 witnesses, has been examined so far. The conclusion of trial shall thus take long time.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid facts, however, she contends that the petitioner has criminal antecedents and is involved in multiple cases.

5. Responding to the above, counsel for the petitioner contends that of the cases that have been registered against the petitioner, he has already been acquitted in two while he is on bail in six cases, the status of five cases is unknown while FIR in the other two cases has already been quashed. He thus contends that in case the specific role of the petitioner is to be seen, the same would only be in the nature of an offence punishable under

Section 118(1) of the BNS, 2023.

6. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations attributed to the petitioner, the period of custody as well as the stage of trial and noticing that the petitioner cannot be incarcerated for the delay in conclusion of prosecution evidence, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

FEBRUARY 04, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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