



227

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

**CRM-M-26297-2024
DATE OF DECISION: 28.05.2024**

AMIT @ AMIT KUMAR ...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA ... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Rohit Gupta, Advocate for
 Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C., has been invoked for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 180, dated 23.04.2024, under Sections 323/506/34 of IPC, and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959 and Section 195-A added later on registered at Police Station SGM Nagar, Faridabad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner and the petitioner was falsely implicated in this case. He points out that the complainant was allegedly beaten up in day light in the market but there is no MLR. The petitioner is not owner of the vehilce used in the incident. The petitioner is behind the bars since 24.04.2024.

3. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. According to which, the



CRM-M-26297-2024

-2-

petitioner is behind bars for last 1 month and 5 days and seeks dismissal of the prayer made in the petition on the ground that he is involved in other case also.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties, this Court is of the considered view that since the petitioner has already suffered sufficient period in custody i.e. 1 months and 5 days and as per the principle of the criminal jurisprudence, no one should be considered as guilty till the guilt is proved beyond reasonable doubt, whereas in the instant case, trial is prolonged and likely to take long time and detaining the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period would amount to violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India and is against the principle "Bail is a rule, jail is an exception" as elucidated in the judgement of Apex Court in "***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another***;; (2018) 3 SCC 22".

As far as the pendency of other cases and involvement of the petitioner in other cases is concerned, reliance can be placed upon the order of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as "***Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab***" decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending



CRM-M-26297-2024

-3-

cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial of the concession of bail.

6. In view of the aforesaid discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. The petition is allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

28.05.2024
anuradha

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No