



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

**CRM-M-55033-2025**  
Date of Decision: 08.10.2025

Baljinder Singh @ Balli

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate and  
Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.218 dated 29.07.2023 under Sections 307, 34, 120-B IPC and Sections 25, 25(6), 25(7), 29-B Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sector-17, HUDA, Jagadhri Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Kamaldeep Singh Khabbal. It was alleged that his elder brother Satbir lives in Ireland, whereas, his second brother Baldeep lives in Australia. Baldeep was married with Arjinder Kaur in the year 2016. There was a matrimonial discord between his brother Baldeep and his wife and they were divorced in the year 2018. Baljinder Singh (petitioner) i.e. the brother-in-law of his brother Baldeep, nurtured grudge due to divorce between Baldeep and his sister. Hence, on 29.07.2023 at about 4:00 p.m., three persons entered in the garage of the complainant and started firing. His servant Raman suffered fire arm injury on his arm. On hearing the noise, the complainant also rushed there and three boys who were armed with pistols in their hands escaped on the motorcycle alongwith



their respective weapons. The boy, who came out of the garage while running, appeared to be Baljinder Singh son of Pritam Singh. Raman servant of the complainant suffered bullet injury on his right arm due to the fire made by Baljinder Singh and others. He was shifted to the hospital. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 02.08.2023. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 16.07.2024. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that from the allegations made in the FIR, it is apparent that the petitioner has been named on the basis of suspicion and there was no identity of the petitioner established. To buttress his arguments, he has submitted that the injured Raman has already been examined before the trial Court as PW-2 but did not identify the petitioner and he has specifically deposed before the trial Court that after being hit, he became unconscious and thus, he was declared hostile. He submits that once the injured himself has not supported the case of the prosecution, false implication of the petitioner is writ large. He further went on to argue that the prosecution is intentionally delaying the trial as the complainant and other witnesses despite having been given various opportunities, are not appearing before the



trial Court only to prolong the incarceration of the petitioner. He submits that though the petitioner is prosecuted in three other cases, however, he has been acquitted in one case and in rest of the cases, he is on bail. He submits that right of speedy trial is being defeated. He, thus, submits that the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who has been prosecuted in other cases as well. She submits that though the injured has been turned hostile, however, his whole testimony cannot be discarded. She submits that case of the prosecution is corroborated by other evidence as well. She submits that during the investigation, weapon of the offence has already been recovered from the petitioner. She has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner in the present case was arrested on 02.08.2023. Raman injured in the present case has been examined as PW-2 before the trial Court, who has not supported the case of the prosecution. The custody certificate of the petitioner would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 11 months & 22 days as on 04.08.2025. It further reveals that the petitioner is involved in three more cases, however, he is on bail in those cases.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from



commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

10. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**08.10.2025**

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**