



CRM-M-72007-2025 (O&M) and
CRM-M-1374-2026 (O&M)

-1-

216(2) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-72007-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on 12.02.2026

Pronounced on 13.02.2026

Uploaded on 16.02.2026

BALJIT SINGH

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CRM-M-1374-2026 (O&M)

Reserved on 12.02.2026

Pronounced on 13.02.2026

Uploaded on 16.02.2026

SAWINDER SINGH ALIAS SAVINDER SINGH

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Argued by: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal , Advocate
for the petitioner (in both cases).
Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J.

1. Both petitioners seek regular bail in case arising out of FIR No. 57 dated 14.05.2025 under Sections 109, 351(2), 74, 3(5) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25, 27 Arms Act, Police Station Raja Sansi, District Amritsar Rural. Section 25(1) Arms Act was added in the FIR during investigation. This is the second petition for regular bail on behalf of accused Baljit Singh. First petition was dismissed as withdrawn on 22.09.2025.

2. Ravail Singh son of Charan Singh made a report to the police that on 14.05.2025 at about 08:30 AM, his neighbour Sawinder Singh son of Harbans Singh was passing through the lane in his auto rickshaw and his son

Amritpal Singh was also passing from the lane at the same time. Sawinder Singh stopped his auto rickshaw in front of his son, whereafter he (Sawinder Singh) and his son Baljit Singh started abusing Amritpal Singh. He and his nephew Jasbir, sister-in-law Jatinder Kaur wife of Pranam Singh and uncle's son Keval Singh intervened to prevail over Sawinder Singh who started abusing them and a quarrel ensued. The clothes of his sister-in-law were torn. When Sawinder Singh's wife namely Kulvinder Kaur tried to stop them, Baljit Singh ran inside his house and came out whereafter he started firing bullets from his licensed pistol. One bullet passed close to him and another one hit Kulvinder Kaur wife of Sawinder Singh resident of Jhanjoti. Baljit Singh took his licensed pistol and tried to shoot his nephew who avoided the shot. After firing, Baljit Singh ran away and fell down in the lane. Then, he again came back and intentionally tried to shoot Kewal Singh but he was saved as he was standing near electric metre box. After hearing sound of gunfire, people started gathering whereafter Baljit Singh threatened to kill everyone with his licensed pistol and ran away. They ran back into their house out of fear. Kulvinder Kaur's family took her to hospital for treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it was a case of cross-version and petitioners had been falsely involved in the offence. A concocted story was made up by complainant Ravail Singh. In fact, complainant along with others came outside the house of petitioners and Amarjeet Singh fired a shot with his 32 bore pistol towards Kulvinder Kaur which hit her left shoulder whereafter all assailants ran away threatening Kulvinder Kaur and her family members. No cross case was registered as Ravail Singh was an influential person on which account Kulvinder Kaur wife of the petitioner filed a private complaint which was still pending

adjudication. Only one injury was found on the person of Ravail Singh which was simple in nature. The injury suffered by Kulvinder Kaur was declared dangerous to life, yet, the police did not take action against complainant Ravail Singh and others who inflicted the gunshot injury. Petitioners were both implicated in the false and fabricated case and the wrongdoers were left out by the police. Petitioner Baljit, who was attributed a gunshot injury, was behind bars for the last more than 9 months. No injury was attributed to petitioner-Sawinder Singh alias Savinder Singh who was behind bars with effect from 02.11.2025. The allegation of tearing clothes of Jatinder Kaur were also made up with the intention to entangle Sawinder Singh alias Savinder Singh. In the given circumstances, both petitioners deserved to be released on bail.

4. Status reports by way of affidavit of Neeraj Kumar, PPS, DSP, Sub Division Rajasansi, Amritsar have been filed in both the petitions, which are taken on record.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail submitting that petitioners were not entitled to the concession of bail in view of the gravity of offences alleged. It is urged that in case of release on bail, they could misuse the concession by influencing prosecution witnesses.

6. The gunshot injury declared dangerous to life, suffered by Kulvinder Kaur wife of Sawinder Singh, has been attributed to Baljit Singh. It is alleged that Ravail Singh was also shot but the shot passed close to him whereafter Baljit Singh tried to shoot his nephew Jasbir Singh. The injury suffered by Ravail Singh, as per his medico legal report, has been declared simple in nature. Version of Kulvinder Kaur, mother of the petitioner who suffered dangerous to life injury is that the gunshot was fired by Amarjeet Singh with the intention to kill her. In this regard, she has also filed a

criminal complaint under Sections 109, 126(2), 324(2), 324(4), 190, 191, 3(5) BNS and Section 25/54/59 Arms Act against Amarjeet Singh and others which is stated to be pending before learned JMIC, Amritsar. Learned State counsel concedes that statement of Kulvinder Kaur under Section 161 Cr.P.C. has not been recorded during the course of investigation of this case.

7. As against Sawinder Singh the only role attributed to him is tearing the clothes of Jatinder Kaur during the course of the fight.

8. Petitioner Baljit Singh is behind bars for the last nine months Sawinder Singh alias Savinder Singh is in custody for the last more than three months. Investigation is complete and challan has been filed in the case. Trial to conclude is likely to take some time. Whether the gunshot injuries were inflicted by the petitioner or by Amarjeet Singh, against whom Kulvinder Kaur has filed a criminal complaint, would be a matter of trial, upon appreciation of evidence led. Trial is likely to take some time in conclusion. Antecedents of the petitioners are clean. They are not involved in any other case. There is no apparent flight risk, nor any reason to believe that petitioners would obstruct the Trial. In the given facts and circumstances of the case, but without commenting on merits, the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to their furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

13.02.2026
HS.CHAUHAN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No