



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

229

CRM-M-17306-2024
Date of decision: 22.05.2024

GURPREET SINGH @ BILLAPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Gaurav Kalsi, Advocate for
Mr. H.S. Batth, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, the petitioner craves for indulgence of this Court for his being enlarged on regular bail, in case FIR No.0084 dated 23.05.2023, under Sections 302, 506 and 34 of IPC, and under Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE PETITIONER

2. The instant FIR has been registered on a complaint made by one Harbhajan Singh, the relevant extract of the FIR (supra), reads as under:-

Statement of Harbhajan Singh son of late Puran Singh son of late Suba Singh resident of village Saidpur, Police Station Sadar Patti. Tehsil Patli, District Tarn Taran, aged about 75 years. Mobile No: 99142-56415, stated that I am resident of the aforesaid address and am agriculturist. We are four brothers. My other three brothers have died. I have three children out of whom my eldest son jagdeep Singh died about 15 years ago. Younger to



- 2-

him is my daughter Manjinder Kaur, who is married and my youngest son is Jagroop Singh, aged about 26 years. About two months ago, my son Jagroop Singh and a girl from our village Manjot Kaur daughter of Ranjit Singh son of Bakshish Singh went from the village with mutual consent and returned after 4-5 days on account of counselling by family members and went back to their respective homes. But Jujbir Singh son of Daljit Singh, the son of the uncle (taya) of Manjot Kaur kept this grudge in his mind and kept threatening us to teach us a lesson. Today on 23.05.2023, at about 6:00 P.M., my son Jagroop Singh along with fellow villagers was playing football in the ground of the government school of our village. I along with my nephew Karnaljit Singh son of Harjinder Singh went on motorcycle to bring Jagroop Singh for some important work at Prome Tahod on one side of the ground and called to Jogroop Singh, when he was coming towards us, then Jubly Singh son of Daja Singh fotowed him, who had a pistol in his hand and was accompanied by two other unidentified companions, who while coming raised lalkara that Jugroop singh should not escape Today, then infront of us. Jajbir Singh fired straight shot with his pistol, which hit my son Jagroop Singh on the back side of his neck and my son fell on the ground in a pool of blood. We raised a loud alarm mar dita mar dita. then the assallants threatened us and fled away from the spot along with their respective weapons. I and Karnaljit Singh arranged a conveyance and took Jagroop Singh to the Civil Hospital, Patti for treatment, where the doctor declared Jagroop Singh dead upon checking. The reason of the grudge is that about two months earlier, my son Jagroop Singh and Manjot Kaur, the daughter of Judgbir Singh's uncle, left home with mutual consent, but later on both parties compromised the matter and returned with mutual consent. However, Jajbir Singh kept a grudge. in his mind. Due to that, Judgbir Singh in connivance



with his companions has murdered my son Jagroop Singh by firing shots. I left my nephew Karnaljit Singh in the Civil Hospital, Patti for the protection of the dead body and was going along with Jaswinder Singh son of Surjit Singh resident of Saidpur to inform you in the Police station that you met me. Statement is recorded, heard, is correct. Due legal action be taken."

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner, in his asking for the hereinabove extracted relief, has made the following submissions:-

- (i) There is no evidence against the present petitioner, which can connect him with the alleged crime, rather it is a case of false implication;***
- (ii) The name of the present petitioner has not been figured in the FIR, whereas, his name has surfaced only on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused;***
- (iii) There is no such evidence on record, to establish that petitioner is the main conspirator in the alleged crime;***
- (iv) This Court vide order dated 14.02.2024, in CRM-M-55490-2023, had extended the relief of regular bail to one of the co-accused namely Kuljinder Kaur.***
- (v) Petitioner has suffered incarceration of more than 11 months, as on today.***
- (vi) Out of the total 10 prosecution witnesses cited in the final report, none has been examined till date.***

**SUBMISSIONS OF THE LEARNED STATE COUNSEL**

4. Per contra, the learned State counsel has vociferously opposed the grant of regular bail to the present petitioner, and has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner, as issued by the Superintendent of Sub Jail Patti. The same is taken on record. A perusal of the custody certificate reveals that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 11 months and 19 days, as on today. A perusal of the custody certificate further reveals that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

5. Status report by way of affidavit dated 22.05.2024, of Sh. Kanwalpreet Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Patti, Camp at Patti, District Tarn Taran, has been filed on behalf of respondent-State. The same is taken on record. What surfaced on perusal of the reply (supra), is that the present petitioner along with Jujbir Singh (main accused), and co-accused Kuljinder Kaur, hatched a conspiracy to murder Jagroop Singh, in the house of Jujbir Singh.

ANALYSIS

6. Before embarking upon the process of evaluating the arguments addressed by the learned counsels for the parties and penning down any opinion upon the instant petition, it is deemed imperative to capture an overview of some significant legal propositions.

7. *“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 Baliy”, 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.

8. 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.

9. In “**Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab**”, (1980) 2 SCC 565 **at 586-588**, the purpose of granting bail is set out by the Hon’ble Supreme Court 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, AIR 1924 Calcutta 476 (479, 480) that 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 Allahabad 504 (SB) 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. H.L. Hutchinson, AIR 1931 Allahabad 356 at p. 358 it was said that it was very unwise to make an attempt to lay down any particular rules which 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.

XX

XX

XX

29. In Gurcharan Singh v. State (Delhi Admn.) (1978) 1 SCC 118 it was observed by Goswami, J., who spoke for the Court, that "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, Vol. 8, page 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.”

10. Also, in **“Gudikanti Narasimhulu and others Versus Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh”, 1978 AIR (Supreme Court) 429**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court, speaking through Krishna Iyer, J., has enunciated the principles of bail thus :

“9. Thus the legal principle and practice validate the court considering the likelihood of the applicant interfering with witnesses for the prosecution or otherwise polluting the process of justice. It is not only traditional but rational, in this context, to enquire into the antecedents of a man who is applying for bail to find whether he has a bad record-particularly a record which suggests that he is likely to commit serious offences while on bail. In regard to habitual, it is part of criminological history that a thoughtless bail order has enabled the bailee to exploit the opportunity to inflict further crimes on the member of society. Bail discretion, on the basis of evidence about the criminal record of a defendant, is therefore not an exercise in irrelevance.

10. The significance and sweep of Article 21 make the deprivation of liberty a matter of grave concern and permissible only when the law authorising it is reasonable, even-handed and geared to the goals of community good and State necessity spelt out in Article 19. Indeed, the considerations I have set out as criteria are germane to the constitutional proposition I have deduced. Reasonableness postulates intelligent care and predicates that deprivation of freedom by refusal of bail is not for punitive purpose but for the bifocal interests of justice - to the individual involved and society affected.

11. We must weight the contrary factors to answer the test the reasonableness, subject to the need for securing the presence of the



bail applicant. It makes sense to assume that a man on bail has a better chance to prepare of present his case than one remanded in custody. And if public justice is to be promoted. mechanical detention should be demoted. In the United States, which has a constitutional perspective close to ours, the function of bail is limited, 'community roots' of the applicant are stressed and, after the Vera Foundation's Manhattan Bail Project, monetary suretyship is losing ground. The considerable public expense in keeping in custody where no danger of disappearance or disturbance can arise, is not a negligible consideration. Equally important is the deplorable condition, verging on the inhuman, of our sub-jails, that the unrewarding cruelty and expensive custody of avoidable incarceration makes refusal of bail unreasonable and a policy favouring release justly sensible.

12. A few other weighty factors deserve reference. All deprivation of liberty is validated by social defence and individual correction along an anti-criminal direction. Public justice is central to the whole scheme of bail law. Fleeing justice must be forbidden but punitive harshness should be minimised. Restorative devices to redeem the man, even through community service, meditative drill, study classes or other resources should be innovated, and playing foul with public peace by tampering with evidence, intimidating witnesses or committing offences while on judicially sanctioned 'free enterprise', should be provided against. No seeker of justice shall play confidence tricks on the court or community. Thus, conditions may be hung around bail orders, not to cripple but to protect. Such is the holistic jurisdiction and humanistic orientation invoked by the judicial discretion correlated to the values of our Constitution.

13. Viewed from this perspective, we gain a better insight into the rules of the game. When a person, charged with a grave offence, has been acquitted at a stage, has the intermediate acquittal pertinence to a bail plea when the appeal before this Court pends? Yes, it has. The panic which might prompt the accused to jump the gauntlet of justice is less, having enjoyed the confidence of the court's verdict once. Concurrent holdings of guilt have the



opposite effect. Again, the ground for denial of provisional release becomes weaker when the fact stares us in the face that a fair finding if that be so - of innocence has been recorded by one court. It may not be conclusive, for the judgment of acquittal may be ex facie wrong, the likelihood of desperate reprisal, if enlarged, may be a deterrent and his own safety may be more in prison than in the vengeful village where feuds have provoked the violent offence. It depends. Antecedents of the man and socio-geographical circumstances have a bearing only from this angle. Police exaggerations of prospective misconduct of the accused, if enlarged, must be soberly sized up lest danger of excesses and injustice creep subtly into the discretionary curial technique. Bad record and policy prediction of criminal prospects to invalidate the bail plea are admissible in principle but shall not stampede the court into a complacent refusal.”

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

12. The reason for forming the above inference emanates from the factum that:- (i) This Court vide order dated 14.02.2024, in CRM-M-55490-2023, had extended the relief of regular bail to one of the co-accused namely Kuljinder Kaur, and the petitioner is on the similar footing; (ii) The petitioner has suffered incarceration of 11 months and 19 days, as on today; (iii) Whether there is sufficient evidence which can connect the petitioner as one of the conspirator, is a moot question, which is required to be adjudicated by the learned trial Court concerned, at an appropriate stage (iv) Out of the total 10 prosecution witnesses cited in the final report, none has been examined so far (v) No fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars, (vi) Trial is not likely to conclude anytime



soon.

FINAL ORDER

13. Considering the hereinabove made discussion, this Court deems it fit and appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. 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.

14. However, anything observed here-in-above shall have no effect on the merits of the trial, and is only meant for deciding the present petition.

15. All pending application(s) stand disposed of accordingly.

22.05.2024
amandeep

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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