



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

132

CRM-M-71910-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 23.02.2026

Gagandeep Singh @ Giani

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Anosh Samson, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.80 dated 13.07.2025, registered under Section(s) 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Section 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 [Sections 54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959 as well as Sections 61(2)/111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 added later on] at Police Station Rangar Nangal, District Batala.

2. Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case are that:-

“xxxxxxxx the present FIR under Section 25 of Arms Act and Section 61 (2) BNS was registered on the statement of complainant ASI Palwinder Singh against accused namely Lovepreet Singh @ Love, Sikander Kumar @ Gola, Onkardeep Singh @ Jashan and Gagandeep Singh @ Gaini. Accused Lovepreet Singh and Sikander Singh @ Gola were arrested on

13.07.2025 and recovery of one pistol .30 bore along with six live cartridges and one pistol .32 bore along with five live cartridges were recovered from both accused respectively. Accused Onkardeep Singh @ Jashan and Gagandeep Singh @ Gaini were also arrested on 13.07.2025 and offence under Section 111 of BNS was added vide DDR No. 03 dated 14.07.2025. On the basis of disclosure statement of Lovepreet Singh, accused Hussandeep Singh, Harwinder Singh and Sarabjit Kaur were nominated in the present case vide DDR No.28 dated 14.07.2025, who are yet to be arrested. On the basis of disclosure statement of Gagandeep @ Gaini, accused Prabh, Ravi and Allen David were nominated in the present case vide DDR No. 8 dated 17.07.2025, who are yet to be arrested. On the basis of secret information, accused Aniket @ Anny and Deepakjit Gill were nominated in the present case vide DDR No. 34 dated 24.07.2025 and both were arrested on 24.07.2025. Five live cartridges were recovered from the possession of Aniket @ Anny. On the basis of disclosure statement of Aniket @ Anny and Deepakjit Gill, accused Amritpal Singh @ Waddi was nominated in the present case vide DDR No. 16 dated 26.07.2025.”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 13.07.2025 and has undergone an actual custody of more than 07 months. He submits that even though, the final report was filed on 10.10.2025, however, no charge has been framed so far. He

contends that total 15 prosecution witnesses are also to be examined and hence, the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time. He submits that no recovery pursuant to the arrest of the petitioner in the present case has been effected. It is also contended that the case of the petitioner would be at par with co-accused/Lovepreet Singh @ Love, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 11.12.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-58925-2025.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner is involved in other cases as well. He however does not dispute that the petitioner is on bail in those cases and in the present case, no recovery was effected from the petitioner. The stage of trial and the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner is also not disputed by him. It is also not disputed that the case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused/Lovepreet Singh @ Love, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, the case being at par with co-accused/Lovepreet Singh @ Love, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail, the stage of the proceedings, and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear 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 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

23.02.2026

Mangal Singh

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