

2023:PHHC:165567

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

109

CRM-M-35167-2023(O&M)
Date of Decision : December 22, 2023

RAJNISH

.....Petitione

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Partap Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Gourav Jangra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)
CRM-52308-2023

1. Through the instant application, the petitioner seeks addition of offence punishable under Section 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 in the head note/prayer clause of the main case, alongwith offences already mentioned therein.

2. For the good and valid reason as assigned in the application, coupled with no objection given by the learned State counsel, same is allowed.

3. Registry is directed to make necessary corrections accordingly.

CRM-M-35167-2023

4. Through the instant petition, the petitioner craves for

indulgence of this Court for his being enlarged on regular bail, in case FIR No. 562, dated 30.12.2022, under Sections 21-C, 22-C, 25 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal.

5. In the instant matter, co-accused namely, Karanjeet Singh and Charanjit were intercepted by the investigating agency in the District Karnal, whereas, they belong to the District Amritsar, Punjab, who were allegedly carrying-contraband. The contraband was alleged to have been recovered from the bag of co-accused Charanjit Singh. It is not under dispute that the contraband which was recovered from Charanjit Singh, falls within the category of commercial quantity. On the disclosure statement of co-accused Charanjit Singh, the present petitioner has been arrayed as accused in the instant FIR, wherein he disclosed that he had purchased the allegedly recovered contraband from the present petitioner.

6. This Court had asked the learned State counsel to file a specific affidavit detailing therein whether except the disclosure statement (*supra*) is there any recovery effected subsequent to the arrest of the petitioner, or is there any other incriminating evidence collected against the petitioner during investigation.

7. In response to the above direction, a status report has been filed by the learned State counsel, by way of an affidavit sworn by Mr.Subhash Chander, Superintendent of Police, Indri, Karnal, wherein, it has been stated as under:-

“4) That after completion of the investigation against Karanjeet Singh @ Raju, Charanjeet Singh and Rajnish, the final charge sheet

under section 173 (2) of Cr.P.C. was prepared by SHO Police Station Taoari, Karnal and same will be submitted before the Ld. Illaqa Magistrate, Karnal as soon as possible. It is submitted that SI Sukhbir had collected the custody certificate from District Jail Karnal of the petitioner and the copy of the same is attached as Annexure R-V for the kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.

5) That the accused had filed an application before the Ld. Court of Sh. Yogesh Chaudhary, Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal for seeking the regular bail and the said bail application has been dismissed vide order dated 03.07.2023.

6) That from the perusal of record of police station Jhinhana, District Shamli (U.P), there was no criminal case was found registered against the petitioner/accused except the present FIR.

7) That from the perusal record of police investigation no call record was found against the petitioner with co-accused.

8) That from the perusal record of police station investigation no recovery was affected from petitioner.”

ANALYSIS

8. A perusal of the abovesaid, it makes clear revelation that no recovery was effected from the petitioner after his arrest and there is no any call record with the investigating agency, which can connect the petitioner with co-accused.

9. *“Bail is the Rule and Jail is an Exception”*. This basic principle of criminal jurisprudence was laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, way back in 1978, in its landmark judgment titled ***“State of Rajasthan V. Balchand alias Baliay”, 1977 AIR 2447, 1978 SCR (1) 535***. This principle finds its roots in one of the most distinguished fundamental rights, as enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Though the underlying objective behind detention of a person is to ensure easy availability of an accused for trial, without any inconvenience, however, in case the presence of an accused can be secured otherwise, then detention is not compulsory.

10. The right to a speedy trial is one of the rights of a detained

person. However, while deciding application for regular bail, the Courts shall also take into consideration the fundamental precept of criminal jurisprudence, which is “the presumption of innocence”, besides the gravity of offence(s) involved.

11. In “***Nikesh Tarachand Shah V. Union of India***”, (2018) 11 SCC 1, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has recorded the following:-

“14. In Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565 at 586-588, the purpose of granting bail is set out with great felicity as follows:-

“27. It is not necessary to refer to decisions which deal with the right to ordinary bail because that right does not furnish an exact parallel to the right to anticipatory bail. It is, however, interesting that as long back as in 1924 it was held by the High Court of Calcutta in Nagendra v. King-Emperor the object of bail is to secure the attendance of the accused at the trial, that the proper test to be applied in the solution of the question whether bail should be granted or refused is whether it is probable that the party will appear to take his trial and that it is indisputable that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. In two other cases which, significantly, are the ‘Meerut Conspiracy cases’ observations are to be found regarding the right to bail which deserve a special mention. In K.N. Joglekar v. Emperor [AIR 1931 All 504 : 33 Cri LJ 94] it was observed, while dealing with Section 498 which corresponds to the present Section 439 of the Code, that it conferred upon the Sessions Judge or the High Court wide powers to grant bail which were not handicapped by the

restrictions in the preceding Section 497 which corresponds to the present Section 437. It was observed by the court that there was no hard and fast rule and no inflexible principle governing the exercise of the discretion conferred by Section 498 and that the only principle which was established was that the discretion should be exercised judiciously. In Emperor v. Hutchinson [AIR 1931 All 356, 358 : 32 Cri LJ 1271] it was said that it was very unwise to make an attempt to lay down any particular rules which will bind the High Court, having regard to the fact that the legislature itself left the discretion of the court unfettered. According to the High Court, the variety of cases that may arise from time to time cannot be safely classified and it is dangerous to make an attempt to classify the cases and to say that in particular classes a bail may be granted but not in other classes. It was observed that the principle to be deduced from the various sections in the Criminal Procedure Code was that grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception. An accused person who enjoys freedom is in a much better position to look after his case and to properly defend himself than if he were in custody. As a presumably innocent person he is therefore entitled to freedom and every opportunity to look after his own case. A presumably innocent person must have his freedom to enable him to establish his innocence.

28. Coming nearer home, it was observed by Krishna Iyer, J., in *Gudikanti Narasimhulu v. Public Prosecutor* [(1978) 1 SCC 240 : 1978 SCC (Cri) 115] that: (SCC p. 242, para 1)

“... the issue of bail is one of liberty, justice, public

safety and burden of the public treasury, all of which insist that a developed jurisprudence of bail is integral to a socially sensitized judicial process. . . . After all, personal liberty of an accused or convict is fundamental, suffering lawful eclipse only in terms of procedure established by law. The last four words of Article 21 are the life of that human right.”

29. *In Gurcharan Singh v. State (Delhi Administration) [(1978) 1 SCC 118 : 1978 SCC (Cri) 41] it was observed by Goswami, J., who spoke for the court, that: (SCC p. 129, para 29)*

“There cannot be an inexorable formula in the matter of granting bail. The facts and circumstances of each case will govern the exercise of judicial discretion in granting or cancelling bail.”

30. *In AMERICAN JURISPRUDENCE (2d, Volume 8, p. 806, para 39), it is stated:*

“Where the granting of bail lies within the discretion of the court, the granting or denial is regulated, to a large extent, by the facts and circumstances of each particular case. Since the object of the detention or imprisonment of the accused is to secure his appearance and submission to the jurisdiction and the judgment of the court, the primary inquiry is whether a recognizance or bond would effect that end.”

It is thus clear that the question whether to grant bail or not depends for its answer upon a variety of circumstances, the cumulative effect of which must enter into the judicial verdict. Any one single circumstance cannot be treated as of universal validity or as necessarily justifying the grant or refusal of bail.”

12. Also, in *Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No.2271 of 2010*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has insisted upon striking a perfect balance of sanctity of an individual's liberty as well as the interest of the society, in grant or refusing bail. The relevant extract of the judgment (*supra*) is reproduced hereinafter:-

3. *The society has a vital interest in grant or refusal of bail because every criminal offence is the offence against the State. The order granting or refusing bail must reflect perfect balance between the conflicting interests, namely, sanctity of individual liberty and the interest of the society. The law of bails dovetails two conflicting interests namely, on the one hand, the requirements of shielding the society from the hazards of those committing crimes and potentiality of repeating the same crime while on bail and on the other hand absolute adherence of the fundamental principle of criminal jurisprudence regarding presumption of innocence of an accused until he is found guilty and the sanctity of individual liberty.*

13. This Court has examined the instant petition on the touchstone of the hereinabove extracted settled and legal principle(s) of law and is of the considered opinion that the instant petition is amenable for being allowed.

FINAL ORDER

14. Considering the specific stand taken by the prosecution agency, through the affidavit (*supra*) as well as the stage of trial, i.e. only

the final report has been filed and the charges are yet to be framed, and that the petitioner is behind bars since 02.01.2023, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of trial. Therefore, without commenting upon the merits and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on furnishing of bail bond and surety bond to the satisfaction of concerned Chief Judicial Magistrate/trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

15. However, it is clarified that if in future, the petitioner is found indulging in commission of similar offences, as are involved herein, the respondent-State shall be at liberty to make an appropriate application seeking cancellation of regular bail, as granted by this Court. Moreover, anything observed here-in-above shall have no effect on the merits of the trial and is meant for deciding the present petition only.

December 22, 2023
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No