



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

**CRM-M-14903-2025
Reserved on: 22nd May, 2025
Pronounced on: 29th May, 2025**

Dalbir Singh @ Dalli

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. R.S. Rai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Anurag Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 174 dated 20.10.2024 registered under Sections 103(1) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by complainant Gulsher Singh, stating therein that he was working as an accountant in the shop of Harbilas Singh. Accused Chatan @ Pammi had to pay an amount of Rs. 37,19,103/- to Harbilas Singh



and to discharge his liability, he had executed sale deed of land measuring 11 kanals in the favour of Harbilas Singh. However, then he took illegal possession of 3 kanals out of that land. Litigation was going on between Harbilas Singh and Chatan and the latter had threatened the complainant and Harbilas Singh to face dire consequences when they had gone to attend hearing of a case about two months back. He further alleged that on 19.10.2024, Harbilas Singh was going towards his house from his shop in his car, when two youths while riding on a motorbike intercepted him. Within the sight of the complainant, they fired four-five gunshots at Harbilas Singh and thereafter they fled. The complainant took the victim to hospital but he has succumbed to his injuries. While raising suspicion that Chatan might have a hand in murder of the victim, he prayed for taking action in the matter. On his statement, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. During investigation, accused Chatan was arrested on 21.10.2024 and was interrogated. On 22.10.2024, the complainant recorded a supplementary statement. Son of the deceased also recorded his statement on 23.10.2024. On the basis of a secret information, the accused Gurnam Singh and Parveer were arrested. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statements admitting their participation in the murder of the victim and got recovered the vehicle and a country-made pistol used at the time of occurrence. On the basis of disclosure statement of accused Gurnam Singh, the petitioner was nominated as such. He was arrested on 28.10.2024. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the murder of the victim. Some other accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands



completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused Gurnam Singh, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. He is a specially abled person suffering from 78% physical disability. The allegations against him are that he had instigated the co-accused Gurnam Singh to kill the victim in order to take revenge of death of his father from the victim but there is no basis for these allegations. He is in custody since long. Trial would take time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. The complicity of the petitioner in murder of the victim has been established from the disclosure statement of the co-accused. There are other circumstances as well connecting him with the crime. It is argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have instigated the co-accused Gurman Singh to commit murder of the victim since the father of the



petitioner had committed suicide that had been allegedly abetted by the victim. The co-accused Gurman Singh, is none else but the first cousin of the present petitioner. At this stage, no motive whatsoever has been attributed to him, as to why, he would falsely involve the petitioner. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Trial has commenced and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. The prolonged period of custody of the petitioner in such like case, is not a ground for extending benefit of bail. In view the discussion as made above but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

8. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

9. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

29th May, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No