

CRA-D-239-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-D-239-2026

JUDGEMENT RESERVED ON	JUDGEMENT PRONOUNCED ON	OPERATIVE PART PRONOUNCED OR FULL	UPLOADED ON
11.03.2026	10.04.2026	FULL PRONOUNCED	10.04.2026

Baljeet Singh ...Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Yajur Sharma, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, A.A.G., Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section
265	17.12.2024	Islamabad, Amritsar	3,4,5 of Explosive Substances Act, 303(2), 317(2), 61(2) BNS, 16, 17, 18, 20 of UAPA

Bail Application number before the Sessions Court	BA/576/2026
Date of Decision	20.01.2026

1. Aggrieved by the dismissal of regular bail by the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide order dated 20.01.2026, the appellant had come up before this Court by filing the present appeal under Section 21 of the National Investigation Agency Act, 2008.

2. Per paragraph no. 26 of the status report, the appellant has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1.	74	26.12.2024	21, 21(c), 29 of NDPS Act, 25 of Arms Act and 3,4,5 of Explosive Act	SSOC, Amritsar

3. The facts of the case are being taken from the status report dated March 9, 2026 filed by Assistant Commissioner of Police, Amritsar. On December 17, 2024, when the

police party was conducting search to detect crime, then they heard a loud explosion. Based on that, they reached at the spot but did not notice any loss of life, however, given a blast had occurred due to some explosive substance, an FIR was registered under Explosives Act. After some time in electronic media, one 'Jeewan Fauji Group' claimed responsibility of the said blast and the news read as follows:

“Waheguru Ji Ka Khalsa, Waheguru Ji Ki Fateh. Today, the grenade thrown in Islamabad Police Station of Amritsar, I Jeevan Fauzi take responsibility for it. All this has been done to tell the police what they, along with the governments, have done to Sikhs and their families from 1984 till now and what they will do further. The answer will be given in this manner. The houses which this force got vacated from Sikhs, their own houses will also not remain. Those who have raised the walls of police stations should also remain ready, answer will be given. As far as the matter of removing turbans is concerned, whichever policeman now touches the turban of a Sikh, special attention will be kept on him; the responsibility of himself and his family will be his own.” Babbar Khalsa

4. After that, the investigation started. CCTV footage was examined and based on the same, the police was able to arrest one Gurjit Singh. Subsequently, investigation also revealed the involvement of Baljeet Singh because of the call details, most of them originating from international mobile numbers. Based on such call details, the custody of the appellant was taken and he was interrogated, which led to further disclosure and usage of international mobile numbers and his participation in criminal conspiracy.

5. Counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant was not named in the FIR. This argument is meaningless because the FIR was registered only on hearing an explosion caused by some explosive substance and at that time, there was no occasion for the police to have known the persons behind such explosion, as such non-mentioning of the name of the appellant in the FIR is immaterial.

6. The appellant's next argument is that the WhatsApp communication from some international virtual numbers clearly show that such numbers were inactive and untraceable and since they were virtual numbers, it could not have been detected. Regarding virtual numbers, it cannot be said that the numbers were in fact used by using a proxy server or by VPN and it is all subject matter of evidence before the trial Court. The fact remains that the investigation has found the communications of the appellant with the terrorist groups using a mobile numbers. If the terrorists or criminals use virtual number, the reason is the lack of security measures taken by Department of Telecommunication, Government of India and the loopholes and vulnerabilities in telecom and telephone policies and Internet policies, but it cannot be a ground to grant bail to the appellant. Needless to say, if there were strict protocols by the Department of Telecommunication, then no calls would have taken place

and in turn the terrorists would have been forced to adopt some other means to cause explosion and it would have been very difficult for them to do so in the absence of calls and then it leads down to slow rate of illegal activities. Be that as it may, as far as appellant is concerned, there is evidence and he is not entitled for bail on this ground.

7. The appellant's third point is that he was already granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 23.01.2026 passed in CRM-M No. 2541 of 2026 arising out of FIR No. 74 and as such, his criminal history should not be a reason to deny him bail but this Court is not considering the history of the appellant as a major factor at this stage. What we are concerned is the existence of prima facie case and likelihood of the appellant repeating the offense in case he is granted bail at this stage, as such, he is not entitled for bail even on this ground.

8. The next argument is that the CCTV footage does not clearly indicate involvement of the appellant. Regarding CCTV footage, the observations can only be made after identification is done and the CCTV footage is duly proved in evidence by following Section 63 of BSA. But for the present time, it is also not a ground for bail. Another reason to deny bail is the role of the appellant, as has been pointed out in the reply filed by Assistant Commissioner of Police, which is mentioned in paragraph no. 24 and 25 of the status report which reads as follows:

“The Role of the appellant in the above captioned FIR.

24. That the deponent humbly submits that based on the investigation being carried out in the present case, it has come forth that the present appellant in connivance with and with common intention along with the co-accused Gurjeet Singh had, as per directions of their foreign based handiers, firstly made surveillance of Police Station Islamabad, Amritsar for carrying out a grenade attack. Thereafter, on the day of occurrence, they both had come to the place of occurrence on the motorcycle after taking grenade and hand gloves, which were kept concealed in cremation ground of village Chhapa, Tarn Taran by Gurjeet Singh. The motorcycle was firstly being driven by the co-accused Gurjeet Singh and the present appellant was pillion driver thereon. Thereafter, they shifted their place near Ansh Flour Mills near PS Islamabad, Amritsar as the present appellant Baljeet Singh started driving motorcycle and co-accused Gurjeet Singh sat on pillion seat and after reaching outside the Police Station Islamabad, Amritsar, the co-accused Gurjeet Singh had carried out grenade attack on the Police Station Islamabad, Amritsar. After carrying out the grenade attack, they both had fled away from the spot on the same motorcycle which was driven by the present appellant Baljeet Singh.

Evidence against the appellant

25. That the deponent humbly submits that based on the investigation being carried out in the present case, the following incriminating evidence has so far come on record against the present appellant Baljeet Singh:-

i) Disclosure statements suffered by the present appellant Baljeet Singh and co-accused Gurjeet Singh before the investigating officer at PS SSOC, Amritsar as well as the facts disclosed during their interrogation in the present case by the deponent. The disclosure memos are annexed herewith as Annexure R-1/T and R-2/T for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.

ii) The CCTV footage obtained the DVR of the CCTV cameras installed at Ansh Flour Mills, near PS Islamabad, Amritsar, wherein the present appellant Baljeet Singh and co-accused Gurjeet Singh are visible while moving on the aforesaid motorcycle, while shifting their place on the motorcycle near bakery and the co-accused Gurjeet Singh is visible while taking out grenade from his bag. The call details record of the mobile phone of the co-accused Gurjreet Singh, photographs and pen drive containing CCTV footage are annexed herewith as Annexure R-3, R-4 and R-5 for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.”

9. In the entirety of facts and circumstances, there is not only prima facie evidence but this Court cannot be assured that in case the appellant is granted bail, then he will not again indulge in anti India activities. But he indulge in an aggressive manner using explosions and risking unity and integrity of the country, as such appellant is not entitled to bail, however the trial Court is requested to expedite the trial. The prosecution is also directed not to seek any unnecessary adjournments. It is further clarified that if any of the accused unnecessarily seek adjournment, then the trial Court should appoint a legal aid counsel for that accused who is delaying the trial.

10. **Appeal stands dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

10.04.2026

Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	YES
Whether reportable	NO