



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

Sr. No.215

CRM-M-3445-2024

Date of decision : 29.10.2024

PARMINDER SINGH

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Thukral, Addl. AG, Haryana and
Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C. has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.285 dated 17.09.2023, under Sections 395 and 397 of IPC, registered at Police Station Barara, District Ambala.

2. The brief facts of the case are that a complaint was moved by Kamaljeet Singh, who alleged that he was involved in finance work. His brother-in-law, Rupinder Singh, had given him Rs. 6 lacs to arrange for his nephew's travel abroad. On 16.9.2023, around 8:00 pm, while Kamaljeet was inside his house and his wife was at the gate, an Innova car stopped nearby, Three individuals alighted from the car, who forcibly entered the house. Later three more individuals came there and at gunpoint, they threatened the complainant and forcibly took Rs. 6 lacs in cash, a gold kara, four rings and his mobile phone. On the basis of CCTV footage, the car was identified and Parminder Singh-petitioner, who was driving, was apprehended and identified by the complainant.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that offending vehicle is not owned by the petitioner and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 01 year and 27 days and he has clean antecedents.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He has filed custody certificate in Court today and the same is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 01 year and 27 days and there is no other case registered against the petitioner. He on instructions from the concerned police official submits that challan was presented on 02.12.2023 and charges were framed on 04.03.2024 and out of total 23 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined.

5. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. Admittedly, the challan was presented on 02.12.2023 and charges were framed on 04.03.2024 and out of total 23 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined till date. The petitioner has undergone an actual custody of 01 year and 27 days and there is no other case registered against him.

7. It would be unjust to keep him behind bars looking at the condition of the jails which are not conducive for rehabilitation process and detaining the accused persons in jails would also tantamounts to violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India including the right to speedy trial, and is against the principle “Bail is a rule, jail is an exception” as elucidated in the judgment of Apex Court in **“Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another, (2018) 3 SCC 22”**.



8. As far as the pendency of other cases and involvement of the petitioner in other cases is concerned, reliance has been placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in another case. The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

“As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc.”

9. Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. The Apex Court in **“Abdul Rehman Antulay and others v. R.S. Nayak and another”, 1992(2) RCR (Criminal) 634** observed that Right to Speedy Trial flowing from Article 21 encompasses all the stages, namely the stage of investigation, inquiry, trial, appeal, revision and retrial.

10. The veracity of the allegations leveled against the petitioner shall be established during the course of the trial. The conclusion of the trial will take a considerable time. Therefore, this Court is of the view that further incarceration of the petitioner will not serve any purpose.



11. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. The petitioner shall also abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/intimidate the prosecution witness(s).
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on the date fixed, unless personal presence is exempted.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused of, or for commission of which he is suspected.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

12. In case of breach of any of the above conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail before this Court.

13. However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

29.10.2024

Kavita

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No