



CRM-M-33452 of 2024

-1-

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

306

CRM-M-33452 of 2024  
Date of Decision: 09.07.2025

Balraj Singh @ Bhupi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Rahul Aggarwal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Manisha Batra, J.(Oral)**

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.17 dated 06.02.2024 under Sections 307, 379-B(2), 341 and 34 of the IPC, 1860 (Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sarhali, District Tarn Taran.

2. Briefly stated, the facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that on 05.02.2024, Sukhdev Singh brother of the complainant-Gursewak Singh had gone to Village Jando Ke Sarhali to buy something on his motor-cycle. After sometime, the complainant-Gursewak Singh received a call from his brother informing that he had been intercepted by four persons who had come on a motor-bike and after showing arms, they had snatched his motor-bike and then escaped. On hearing so, the

**CRM-M-33452 of 2024****-2-**

complainant rushed towards the spot and then they made search for the snatched motor-bike. While going towards Village Manu Chahal, the complainant found four youths while riding on two bikes one of which was the vehicle snatched from his brother. His brother who was accompanying him identified the riders as the snatchers. On seeing, the complainant and his brother, they tried to flee from the spot after leaving the snatched motor-cycle. However, they were apprehended. They disclosed their names as Balraj Singh (petitioner), Angrej Singh, Ninja Singh and Jaskaran Pal Singh. Balraj Singh was having a pistol with him and while having scuffle with the complainant, he fired a shot thereby injuring the private part of the complainant and thereafter, they managed to flee. He was rushed to the hospital.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner and co-accused Jaskaran Pal Singh were arrested on 06.02.2024. On interrogation, they suffered a disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime and disclosed the names of the other accused and that the snatched motor-cycle was given to them by Angrej Singh and Ninja Singh. In pursuance of their disclosure statements, the petitioner and co-accused got recovered the snatched motor-cycle as well as the vehicle used by them at the time of committing the offence. The co-accused were subsequently arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 06.02.2024. He is a young student. He is under custody since long. The trial is likely to take time. He does not have any criminal antecedents. A



false recovery has been planted upon him. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any more. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has resisted the prayer made by the petitioner in terms of the status report filed by the respondent-State by arguing that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. He was the one who had fired shot at the victim thereby causing injury in his left inguinal region. The said injury was grievous in nature and was dangerous to life. There are chances of petitioner's absconding or intimidating the witnesses if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, he does not deserve to be extended the benefit of regular bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the material placed on record.

7. The petitioner along with co-accused Jaskaran Pal Singh is alleged to have received the snatched motor-cycle from the co-accused Angrej Singh and Ninja Singh and is further alleged to have fired a shot with pistol on the person of the complainant thereby causing him serious injuries. However, he is in custody since 06.02.2024. Investigation stands completed. No prosecution witness has been examined so far and therefore, the trial will obviously take time to conclude. His further detention would not serve any useful purpose. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents. It is well-settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception.

8. Keeping in view the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the nature of subject offence, and the attendant facts and circumstances of

**CRM-M-33452 of 2024****-4-**

the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

**09.07.2025***D.Bansal***(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE**

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