



CRM-M-44772-2025

1

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

114

CRM-M-44772-2025
Date of decision: 24.02.2026

BALBIR SINGH @ BALVIR SINGH

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail, which is third petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023', has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.59 dated 27.08.2018. The above-mentioned FIR has been lodged for the commission of offence punishable under Section 307 [however charges have been framed under Section 326A] of Indian Penal Code, hereinafter being referred to as IPC, Police Station Khem Karan, District Tarn Taran.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Simranjit Singh', hereinafter being



referred to as complainant only. It was stated by the complainant that due to abusive language being used by the petitioner in the premises of Gurudwara Bhai Lakhia Ji, he was removed from the spot and on account of above-said grudge, on 27.08.2018 at about 03:30 AM, the petitioner came and threw acid, which was kept in a bottle, upon on the complainant. As per complainant he had suffered burn injuries on his face and other body parts.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above-mentioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged, and the investigation taken up.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Mr. Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, the service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State counsel has filed custody certificate. The same be taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than two years and two months, and that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and therefore, the petitioner be admitted on bail.

8. *Per Contra*, the learned State counsel has argued that in the present case the petitioner has committed an offence of a serious nature and secondly, that he has already misused the concession of bail. According to learned State counsel in the exercise of jurisdiction vested in the Court under Section 167(2) Cr.P.C. the petitioner was accorded the benefit of bail but later on he misused the above-mentioned concession, jumped the bail, and thus, if



released on bail, there are chances of repetition of the same events.

9. The record has been perused carefully.
10. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration, for a decision: -

- i) that out of nine prosecution witness, four have already been examined, and therefore there are chances of early disposal of the case;
- ii) that the petitioner is a person, who has already misused the concession by jumping the bail accorded to him;
- iii) that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature.

11. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above-mentioned factors, it is hereby observed that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition is devoid of merits. Hence, the same is hereby **dismissed** accordingly.

12. However the learned trial Court is directed to dispose of the trial within a period of four months from the date of receipt of copy of order.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

24.02.2026

<i>vipin</i>	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	Yes/No