



CRM-M-39370-2025

1

104 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-39370-2025

Date of decision: 29.07.2025

GURMEET SINGH @ NIKKU

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB


...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present: Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S.GREWAL,J. (ORAL)

1. This is a petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 10 dated 25.03.2025 under Sections 308(4) , 351(2), 125, 191(3), 190 BNS and under Sections 25 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Mattewal, District Amritsar Rural.
2. The case of the prosecution is that some unknown persons fired with weapon outside the house of the complainant and after that his nephew received threatening calls demanding ransom amount. During the course of investigation, co-accused Sajanpreet Singh and Dharampreet Singh were arrested and on their disclosure statement, co-accused Balraj Singh was arrested. Thereafter, co-accused Balraj Singh made disclosure statement nominating the petitioner.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and has been nominated only on the basis of the disclosure statement made by the co-accused Balraj Singh. He further submits that there is no independent witness to the alleged occurrence. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.
4. Notice of motion.



CRM-M-39370-2025

2

5. Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf for the respondent-State. He has opposed the prayer for concession of bail to the petitioner on the ground that the weapon was recovered from the petitioner.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record.

7. At the time of considering the anticipatory bail, the Court is required to consider factors such as the nature and the gravity of the offence, the role attributed to the petitioner and the specific facts of the case. Keeping in view the fact that weapon was recovered from the petitioner and the petitioner actually participated in the crime. So, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

8. In the light of above discussion, this Court is of the view that it is not a fit case where the petitioner is entitled for concession of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

9. Anything observed hereinabove shall have no effect on the merits of the case as it is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition.

29.07.2025

*renu***(H.S.GREWAL)**
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No