



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206+210

CRM-M-10216-2025

PAWANPREET SINGH ALIAS PAWAN

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CRM-M-31167-2025

BHUPINDER SINGH ALIAS GATTU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

Decided on : 09.10.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rajiv Kumar Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-10216-2025), and
Mr. H.S. Grewal, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-31167-2025).

Mr. Bareen Pratap Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. This common order shall dispose of both the aforementioned petitions i.e. CRM-M-10216-2025 and CRM-M-31167-2025.

2. Petition i.e. CRM-M-10216-2025 has been filed by the petitioner namely Pawanpreet Singh alias Pawan, seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.215, dated 16.08.2023, under Section(s) 307, 336, 160, 148, 149 of IPC and under sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar.

Petition i.e. CRM-M-31167-2025 has been filed by the petitioner namely Bhupinder Singh @ Gattu, seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.215, dated 16.08.2023, under Section(s) 336, 160 of IPC and sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959, to which sections 307, 148, 149



of IPC have been added later on during investigation, registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar.

3. The allegations in nutshell are that members of two groups started fighting with each other and at that time, they were armed with different weapons and they resorted to brick batting and also fired shots in air. During investigation of the case, petitioner namely Pawanpreet Singh alias Pawan who was not named in the FIR, was arrested by the police on 14.09.2023, whereas, petitioner – Bhupinder Singh @ Gattu was named in the FIR.

4. Counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners were falsely named in the present case and no weapon was recovered from the possession of petitioner – Pawanpreet Singh alias Pawan. Counsel for the petitioners further submits that even otherwise, no one sustained injuries at the time of the alleged occurrence and *challan* stands presented against the petitioners. So, prayer is made that the petitioners be released on regular bail.

5. In the status report dated 30.07.2025, already filed by learned State counsel in CRM-M-10216-2025 relating to petitioner Pawanpreet Singh @ Pawan, it has been stated that petitioner, in connivance with other accused persons, attacked the victim and weapons were used during the incident. However, no weapon has been recovered from the petitioner. The only allegation against Pawanpreet Singh @ Pawan is that he was present at the spot and is said to have played a major role in the incident, which was allegedly carried out with the intent to kill the victim. Importantly, status report also clarifies that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner, nor has he caused any injury to the victim or any other person.

Further, in the status report dated 05.08.2025 filed in CRM-M-31167-2025 concerning petitioner Bhupinder Singh @ Gattu, it has been mentioned that a .32 bore pistol was recovered from him. However, no injury has been attributed to him in relation to the incident. Petitioner Bhupinder Singh @ Gattu has been implicated in the present case based solely on secret information, and no other substantial evidence was



highlighted during the course of hearing. The only additional information brought on record pertains to his involvement in two other criminal cases, i.e. FIR No.220 dated 19.08.2023 under Sections 302, 34, and 120-B IPC at Police Station Jandiala, and FIR No.48/2022 under Sections 21 and 29 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Tarsikka, District Amritsar Rural.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that petitioners are not entitled to the concession of regular bail in view of the gravity of the offence committed by them and there is a strong apprehension that petitioners can misuse the concession of regular bail by intimidating and influencing the prosecution witnesses, or tamper with the evidence after their release on bail.

7. This Court has considered the submissions made by the counsel for the respective parties.

8. In view of the fact that it is a no injury case and after completion of investigation, the police has presented the *challan* against the petitioners, and it will take time for conclusion of trial, no useful purpose is going to be served by keeping the petitioners in custody for any further period.

9. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioners, and the factors noticed hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioners.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**. Petitioners (in both the petitions) are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. 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.

12. Petitions stand disposed of.

13. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.10.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: ✓YES/NO

Whether Reportable: ✓YES/NO