



CRM-M-71030-2025

-1-

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

135

CRM-M-71030-2025

Date of Decision: 17.03.2026

BALJINDER SINGH @ LEELA**... PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****... RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Vivek Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 0149 dated 14.10.2025 under Sections 109, 115(2), 191(3), 190, 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Sangat, District Bathinda.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant, along with his brother Karamjit Singh, had gone to the house of Arshdeep Singh to collect the balance amount of ₹1,500/- pending against the purchase of a washing machine. Arshdeep Singh allegedly felt insulted and threatened to teach them a lesson. Later, at about 08:00 PM, when the complainant and his brother were near the house of Tek Singh along with Dharampreet Singh and Jajjvir Singh, the accused persons, armed with sticks and a 12 bore gun, arrived at the spot. Upon a *lalkara* raised by Arshdeep Singh, Sandeep Singh @ Kalu fired a gunshot with an intention to kill, on the right leg and abdomen of the

**CRM-M-71030-2025****-2-**

complainant, both legs, right arms and feet of Dharampreet Singh as well as both legs of Jajjvir Singh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner is the father of Sandeep Singh @ Kalu, who allegedly fired the gunshot from a pistol licensed in the name of the petitioner. However, the said pistol was taken by the son without the knowledge or consent of the petitioner, and he was not aware of the same. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 15.10.2025, is not involved in the alleged occurrence, and therefore prays for the grant of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. P.S. Pandher, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail. He submits that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence and, therefore, is not entitled to the concession of regular bail. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months and no other case is pending against him.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances and considering that the petitioner has been in custody for the last 05 months, is not involved in any other case, and no specific overt act is attributed to him and that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by further incarceration of the petitioner.



CRM-M-71030-2025

-3-

Moreover, it is a settled principle of law that “*bail is the rule and jail is the exception.*” Hence, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

17.03.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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