

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24397-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision : 01.06.2023

Afsar Ali ... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. A.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasleen Kaur, DAG Punjab.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. This is the second petition under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.188 dated 29.07.2019 under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) (Sections 419, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC were added later on) and Sections 66 and 66-D of the Information Technology (Amendment) Act), 2008 registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala, District Patiala. The first petition being CRM-M-11420-2021 was dismissed vide order dated 18.01.2022.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the change in circumstances is that the trial is not progressing and out of 20 witnesses, only 6 have been examined so far. Learned counsel would further

contend that the complainant in the present case has since been examined and that the official witnesses have not been appearing despite bailable/non-bailable warrants having been issued against them. It has further been pointed out that vide order dated 29.03.2023, the salary of one of the official witnesses was also attached for non-appearance. Learned counsel would further contend that the co-accused namely, Noor Ali and Ataul Ansari @ Atul Ansari, have since been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 09.06.2020 passed in CRM-M-3208-2020 and vide order dated 29.04.2023 passed in CRM-M-10204-2023, respectively.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent-State relying upon the status report filed by way of an affidavit of Sanjeev Singla, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, City-I District Patiala, has stated that the petitioner is a habitual offender and there was a recovery of 33 Aadhaar Cards and 76 Sim Cards of different companies. However, counsel for the State is not in a position to deny that in the present case the challan was filed on 08.11.2019 and the charges were framed on 20.12.2019 and out of 20 witnesses only 6 have been examined and that some of the official witnesses are not appearing before the Court for recording of their statements despite issuance of bailable/non-bailable warrants against them. Further, counsel for the State is not in a position to deny that the salary of one of the official witnesses has also been attached for non-appearance and despite that the official witnesses are not appearing. She is also not in a position to deny that the co-accused namely, Noor Ali and Ataul Ansari @ Atul Ansari, have since been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 09.06.2020 passed in

CRM-M-24397-2023 (O&M)

-3-

CRM-M-3208-2020 and vide order dated 29.04.2023 passed in CRM-M-10204-2023, respectively.

4. Heard.

5. In the present case the petitioner has been in custody for a period of 3 years, 9 months and 12 days. Though there are other cases pending against the petitioner, however, the same cannot be a ground for denying bail to the petitioner in the present case. The challan in the present case was filed on 08.11.2019 and charges were framed on 20.12.2019 and till date, out of 20 witnesses, only 06 witnesses have been examined. A perusal of Trial Court orders would reveal that the official witnesses are not coming forward to get their statements recorded despite issuance of bailable/non-bailable warrants against them. Vide order dated 29.03.2023 the salary of one of the official witnesses i.e. SI Karamjit Singh was also attached and it is only thereafter that the said witness appeared and his examination-in-chief was partly recorded. The co-accused namely, Noor Ali and Ataul Ansari @ Atul Ansari, have since been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 09.06.2020 passed in CRM-M-3208-2020 and vide order dated 29.04.2023 passed in CRM-M-10204-2023, respectively

6. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Mohd. Muslim @ Hussain vs. State (NCT of Delhi) [Special Leave Petition (Crl.) Nos.915 of 2023]** decided on **28.03.2023**, has held as under :

“21. Before parting, it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual

is immeasurable. Jails are overcrowded and their living conditions, more often than not, appalling. According to the Union Home Ministry's response to Parliament, the National Crime Records Bureau had recorded that as on 31st December 2021, over 5,54,034 prisoners were lodged in jails against total capacity of 4,25,069 lakhs in the country. Of these 122,852 were convicts; the rest 4,27,165 were undertrials. 22. The danger of unjust imprisonment, is that inmates are at risk of "prisonisation" a term described by the Kerala High Court in A Convict Prisoner v. State 1993 Cri LJ 3242 as "a radical transformation" whereby the prisoner:

"loses his identity. He is known by a number. He loses personal possessions. He has no personal relationships. Psychological problems result from loss of freedom, status, possessions, dignity any autonomy of personal life. The inmate culture of prison turns out to be dreadful. The prisoner becomes hostile by ordinary standards. Self-perception changes."

23. There is a further danger of the prisoner turning to crime, "as crime not only turns admirable, but the more professional the crime, more honour is paid to the criminal". Incarceration has further deleterious effects - where the accused belongs to the weakest economic strata: immediate loss of livelihood, and in several cases, scattering of families as well as loss of family bonds and alienation from society. The courts therefore, have to be sensitive to these aspects (because in the event of an acquittal, the loss to the accused is irreparable), and ensure that trials - especially in cases, where special laws enact stringent provisions, are taken up and

CRM-M-24397-2023 (O&M)

-5-

concluded speedily.”

7. In view of the above, without commenting upon the merits of the case and keeping in view the long custody of the petitioner, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. The petitioner is directed to be released on bail subject to his furnishing heavy bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate/Trial Court concerned.

8. However, the Prosecution will always be at liberty to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found to be misusing the concession of bail in any manner.

9. It is also made clear that any observation made herein shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Disposed off. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

01.06.2023
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO