



CRM-M-66105-2025 (O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107+211

CRM-M-66105-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 08.04.2026

Babu Lal

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Bhupinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

CRM-14296-2026

1. Present application has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS for placing on record the correct typed copy of the FIR (Annexure P-1).
2. Application is allowed and Annexure P-1 is taken on record subject to all just exceptions. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

CRM-M-66105-2025

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Babu Lal, aged 55 years	120	09.04.2023	302, 307, 216, 120-B, 34 IPC and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act	Murthal	Sonipat



CRM-M-66105-2025 (O&M)

2. FIR in the instant case was got registered by complainant – Suraj Bhan and relevant part of it reads as under:

“It is requested that I am Surj Bhan s/o Kehar Singh r/o Murthala. It is village Kurar Ibrahimpur, Murthal District Sonipat. My grandson Sachin s/o Suresh, time about 10:00 PM, today was present at the Sahid Chowk in the village. I was at home at that time. I came to know that Sachin had been shot. At the same time, I and My son Charan Singh arrived at the spot and found Sachin there who had been shot in his stomach. We took him to Park Nidan Hospital in our car for treatment. On the way, Sachin told me and my son Charan Singh that he had been shot by my real uncle Rajesh s/o Sube Singh resident of Khurd, who fled from the spot. Then we admitted Sachin to Park Nidan Hospital for treatment. Several cases are already registered against Rajesh. Strict action should be taken against the above mentioned Rajesh. Sd/- Surajbhan s/o Kehar Singh r/o village Kurar Ibrahimpur, Murthal, District Sonipat dated 8.4.2023.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that neither petitioner's name is mentioned in the FIR nor any allegation is deposed when complainant-Suraj Bhan appeared in the witness box viz. a viz. petitioner-Babu Lal. Learned counsel refers examination-in-chief of PW-2 Suraj Bhan, which reads as under:

“On 08.04.2023 I along with my son Charan Singh were present at my house. It came to our knowledge that Sachin received gun shot injury, at Sadh Chowk. I and my son Charan Singh reached at the spot. Sachin was lying on the ground in the chowk. I and my son Charan Singh took Sachin to the hospital. On the way Sachin told me and my son Charan Singh that his Tau Rajesh son of Subhe Singh fired gun shot upon him. We got admitted Sachin in the hospital for treatment. Police came in the hospital and got signed few papers. I moved application Ex.PW2/A to the police which bears my signature at point A. Sachin died on 10.04.2023 in Delhi Hospital. On 11.04.2023 we performed his last rites. Accused Rajesh present in the court today through VC. I identify him as he is my nephew.”

Thus, submits that the prime accused in the case is Sachin, who is grandfather of Suraj Bhan, thus there being no attribution, learned counsel prays for grant of bail.

**CRM-M-66105-2025 (O&M)**

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made in the petition and submit that role of the petitioner is that, it is he who had supplied weapons to the main accused Rajesh, for firing shots, however, despite being asked again and again by the Court, learned State counsel could not point of availability of any evidence on record against the petitioner that from where it can be assumed that petitioner also had shared common intention in causing murder, apart handing over the pistol to the main accused Rajesh.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and examined the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.

6. Admittedly, nothing was recovered at the time of arrest of the petitioner, who is inside jail since 27.11.2023 for a period of approximately 02 years, 04 months and 10 days. Further, complainant has stated nothing against the petitioner Babu Lal while deposing before the Court, nor does the FIR discloses anything against petitioner. In view of the facts and circumstances having been recorded here above, I do not find any substantive reason for keeping the petitioner inside jail in any longer as the trial may also take considerable time in its conclusion.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to



CRM-M-66105-2025 (O&M)

decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

April 08, 2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

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