

2024:PHHC:003479

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

265

CRM-M-56744-2023
Date of Decision : 11.01.2024

SANDEEP

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, DAG, Haryana.

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. 103 dated 26.07.2023, under Sections 186, 332, 353, 506 and Section 34 of the IPC (Section 333 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station GRP, District Hisar.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE PETITIONER

2. The prosecution agency was set into motion on a statement made by one Rajan, who was posted as Gateman in the Indian Railway.

The gist of the allegations reads as under:-

“To the SHO/GRP/HSR Haryana, Sir it is submitted that I Rajan S/o Sh. Dhoop Singh, Gateman Gate No. C-37 was posted as Gateman duty from on the shift from 08/00 to 20/00 then at about 15/00, Sh. Anant Ram MCM/TELE/BXC came at my gate to repair telephone. Thereafter, at about 15/25 three persons on bike alongwith sharp edged weapons came at my gate from Barwala

Side and one of them was having Sword, one was having axe and one was having Jeli. On reaching all three made life threatening attack on both of us. I got contusion on my back and Anant Ram MCM/TELE/BXC received sword injury on left hand and received injuries on back. Then few persons came to gate from Ravidass Nagar and seeing them all three persons fled on motorcycle towards Bhaini Badshahpur by waiving sword in air and giving threatening us to be killed. Out of these three I know two whose name is Sewak S/o Satta R/ Dhani Prem Nagar and other is Sumit S/o Sh. Satpal Khatri R/o Village Bhaini Badshahpur. We will get our medical done at Maharaja Aggarwal Civil Hospital, Hisar and will present our medical report. And while leaving, the three attackers said that today you have been saved, next time they will kill you. Therefore, I request you to please take strict action against the three attackers.

Sd/- Rajan S/o Sh. Dhoo Singh, Gateman Gate No. C-37 26-07-2023 aged 33 years Signature Anant Ram MCM, Anant Ram S/o Nahar Singh MCM/TELE/BXC 26-07-2023 aged 58 years".

SUBMISSIONS OF LEARNED COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR, and the person who has been named in the FIR has been extended the benefit of anticipatory bail.

He further submits that the weapon used for commission of offence has already been recovered from the petitioner, and he is behind the bars since 12.08.2023. The challan has already been presented before the trial Court concerned in the present matter, and charges are yet to be framed, therefore, the conclusion of trial would take long time.

SUBMISSIONS OF THE LEARNED STATE COUNSEL

4. *Per contra* learned State counsel opposes the asked for relief on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender, and he is involved in two more cases.

He further submits that, grievous injuries have been caused to the person, who was performing his official duty.

Facing with above difficulty, learned counsel for the

petitioner submits that in the other two cases against the petitioner, one of the case the petitioner has already earned acquittal vide order dated 05.02.2019, whereas, in the second case which is arising out of the same case in which the petitioner was acquitted, and in that case the petitioner was declared as a proclaimed offender and now he is regularly appearing in that case.

ANALYSIS

5. *“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.

6. 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.

7. 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.”

8. 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.*

9. 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

10. Considering the fact that the petitioner is behind the bars since 12.08.2023, and final report has already been presented before the learned trial Court concerned, on dated 11.10.2023, and the trial is yet to commence, and other co-accused who has been named in the FIR has already been granted bail, this Court deems it 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.

11. 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.

January 11, 2024
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.

:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable.

:

Yes/No