

IA No. 9/2026 in SC No. 283/2018
State Vs. Balram @ Ballar
FIR No. 75/2018
PS Narela
U/s. 302/365/201/34 IPC

05.05.2026

This is an application under Section 483 BNSS for grant of regular bail moved on behalf of the accused / applicant namely Balram @ Ballar.

Present: Sh. J.S. Malik, Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for the State.
None for the accused /applicant.

Arguments have already been heard.

1. Brief facts of the case are that on 27.01.2018, one boy Pradeep @ Deepu went missing and after 10 to 15 minutes the father/ complainant Mehar Singh called on his mobile number and his son responded that he would be returning soon but did not return and his mobile was found switched off. When despite efforts, his son could not trace out on 01.02.2018, he lodged a missing report vide DD No.36A and an initial FIR was registered under Section 365 IPC. During the course of investigation, it transpired that the accused Balram @ Ballar had allegedly committed murder of Pradeep on the night of 27.01.2018 and disposed off the dead body near Mukul Garden Forest Area, Sonipat, Haryana with the help of another co-accused Raju @ Chotu. Eventually, Section 302 IPC read with Section 201 IPC had been incorporated.

2. It was argued by Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused that accused has been running in JC since 03.02.2018 and has

been falsely implicated in the present case. It was further argued that all the material witnesses have already been examined. It was further argued that there is no previous involvement of the accused / applicant. It is further submitted by him that applicant / accused was granted interim bail on multiple occasions, but he never misused the liberty granted to him and had surrendered well in time. It is further argued that no purpose would be served to keep the accused in custody. That accused is ready to abide by all the terms and conditions. It is prayed that a lenient view be taken.

3. On the other hand, Ld. Substitute Addl. PP for the State vehemently opposed the bail application and argued that allegations against the applicant are serious in nature and if applicant is released on bail, he may threaten the witnesses and he may also jump the bail and prayer is made for dismissal of the bail application.

4. I have heard the Ld. Addl. PP for State and Ld. Counsel for applicant/accused as well as perused the report filed by the IO.

5. As per the postmortem report bearing no. 142/18, BSA Hospital, it has been mentioned vide a subsequent opinion given by the concerned doctor that injury no.1 could be possible by the chunni which was examined and injuries no.2 to 17 were possible with the danda which has been examined. The said weapon of offence had been recovered at the instance of the accused. Even the ECO Car which was used in the commission of offence had been recovered at his instance. The dead body of the victim, which was buried by the accused was also recovered

at the instance of accused and the place was within his special knowledge. There are statements of witnesses and specifically PW9 Anil who has categorically stated about the factum of a quarrel between the accused and the deceased and the deceased was *last seen* with the accused by the public witnesses soon before his death.

There are specific allegations against the accused / applicant. The accused / applicant has played an active role in the commission of alleged offence. Further, matter is at its final end. Considering the grave and serious allegations against the applicant/accused and the active role played by him, no ground for grant of bail is made out at this stage. The application stands dismissed.

Application is disposed off accordingly.

6. ***It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.***

7. Copy of the order be given *dasti* to the Ld. Counsel for the applicant/accused as well as be sent to concerned IO, Ld. Secretary, DLSA (North), through all possible modes, as per rules.

(VANDANA)
Addl. Sessions Judge-02(North)
Rohini Courts Delhi
05.05.2026