



142

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

CRM-M-67927-2025

Date of decision : 23.03.2026

Baldev Singh**....Petitioner****versus****State of Haryana****.... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Ms. Ramandeep Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.227 dated 23.08.2024, under Sections 109(1), 115, 123, 296 of BNS, registered at Police Station Ding, District Sirsa.

2. As per the facts of the case, the present case was registered on the statement of Ravinder Kaur wife of Baldev Singh (petitioner herein). It was alleged that the complainant is married with Baldev Singh for last about 21 years. It was further alleged that her husband was addicted to intoxication and used to fight with her and her children every day. It was alleged that on 19.08.2024, at about 9/9:30 am, they went to spray on cotton crops, where her husband slapped her on face without any reason and sprayed pesticide into her mouth, forcefully. When the complainant tried to push his hand away, the spray also fell into her eyes and when she started vomiting, Baldev Singh called her daughter Ekam,



who came there with paternal Uncle-in-law's son and arranged a vehicle to take her to Government Hospital, Sirsa. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 15.10.2024. He approached the learned Sessions Judge, Sirsa, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 03.03.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She submits that the dispute in the present case is basically of matrimonial nature. She submits that the petitioner is the husband of the complainant. It is submitted that the alleged allegations regarding forcibly administering the poison, are totally false and frivolous. She submits that the petitioner and the complainant-wife, both were affected by the pesticide and the same is evident from the medical record as both were under treatment in the hospital. It is submitted that on account of the matrimonial dispute, the petitioner was roped in the present case in a clandestine manner. To buttress her arguments, she submits that the complainant-wife had already filed one civil suit and a case of maintenance, against the petitioner. It is submitted that even otherwise the material witnesses already stand examined and thus, there is no probability of the petitioner influencing the witnesses. She, thus, submits that the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has also opposed the



submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that because of the on going matrimonial dispute, the petitioner was nurturing a grudge against the wife and thus, he administered the poison i.e. pesticide to her. He submits that the complainant has already been examined and she has supported the case of the prosecution. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, 08 have been examined so far. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is the husband of the complainant. It has been contended before this Court that there is a matrimonial dispute between both i.e. the petitioner and the complainant. The complainant has already filed a civil suit and the maintenance case against the petitioner. The complainant already stands examined. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 05 months and 07 days as on 21.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case. Out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, 08 witnesses have been examined so far. Material witnesses already stand examined.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and

bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.
Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

23.03.2026
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No