



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

126

CRM-M-65596-2024
Decided on : 08.01.2025

Baljit Singh alias Balli

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Jasneet Mehla, Advocate for
Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 109, 125, 115(2), 118(1), 351(1), 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023, read with Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, in a case arising out of FIR No. 87, dated 21.11.2024, registered at Police Station Tarsikka, District Amritsar Rural.

2. As per the allegations, complainant – Shokeen Singh was sleeping in his house along with his nephew Chamkaur Singh and his son Balraj Singh. A call was received from Adarshdeep Singh, who asked him to come outside the house at around 01:00 A.M. (dead hours of the night) on 20.11.2024. Other persons were armed there, who attacked the complainant. Resultantly, a fire shot injury was suffered by the complainant on his knee.

Petitioner Baljit Singh @ Balli, is attributed a 'daatar' blow on the little



finger of the left hand.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner is a young boy, aged about 20 years only and being a student, if he is arrested, may spoil his future career. Therefore, he be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, appearing on advance notice, argues that the conduct of the petitioner and the other co-accused persons is alarming and terrifying, because, they want to attack with weapon during the mid night period at the house of the complainant and the presence of the petitioner on the spot, cannot be doubted at this stage, as a specific allegation of causing injury with 'daatar' is corroborated with medical evidence.

5. After hearing learned counsel from both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is not inclined to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, more for the reason, that all the accused person were armed with weapons and have gone to attack the complainant at his house during night time.

6. Accordingly, finding no merit in the petition, same is dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 08, 2025

J.Ram

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