

2024:PHHC:161985



216-3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54457-2024 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 04.12.2024

PARVEEN KUMAR @ PARVEEN YADAV @ PRAVEEN KUMAR
.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA
.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ramnish Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL).

CRM-43378-2024

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

Exemption from filing typed/certified copies of Annexures is granted.

CRM-M-29659-2024

1. Relief Sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 439 Cr.P.C., seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.15 dated 12.01.2022, under Sections 120-B, 406, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC, 1860 (Section 201 of IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Manesar, Gurugram.

2. Facts

Facts as narrated in the FIR reads as under:-

“The brief facts of the prosecution case are that the a complaint was submitted by the complainant-Kiranpal Yadav against Parveen Yadav, Mamta Yadav etc. and other unknown accomplices and bank officials of the Axis Bank. It has been submitted that accused persons have played fraud and cheated the complainant on the pretext of providing tenders for construction at National Security Guards campus, Manesar by forging the documents and the documents were even used for opening a new bank account in Axis Bank, in the name of "office of GC (Garrison) Station Head Quarters NSG" and in that manner the complainant has been cheated and defrauded by the accused persons. It was requested that legal action be taken against these persons. ”

3. Contentions:

On behalf of the petitioner

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 01.03.2023 and trial is proceedings at snail's pace, wherein out of total 95 prosecution witnesses, only 2 have been examined after framing of charges on 04.01.2024.

On behalf of the State

Status report filed by way of an affidavit of Vipin Kumar Ahlawat, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Manesar, Gurugram is taken on record.

Perusal of the status report shows that no prosecution witness could be produced on account of the multiple applications being made by the petitioner and for that purpose and considering of those applications, time and again matter was deferred before the trial Court. He prays for dismissal of the present petition on the ground that the petitioner is a habitual offender, as he is involved in many other cases.

4. **Analysis**

The petitioner has already suffered incarceration of 1 year, 9 months and 3 days, as is evident from the perusal of the custody certificate filed by learned State counsel, which is taken on record. It is also on record that all the co-accused persons have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court, though the role of these co-accused is contended to be different than that of the present petitioner.

This Court cannot shut its eyes to the fact that trial will take long time, as out of total 95 prosecution witnesses, only 2 have been examined so far after framing of charges on 04.01.2024, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period, which would curtail his right for speedy trial and expeditious disposal, as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India as has been time and again discussed by this Court, while relying upon the judgment of the Apex Court passed in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***. Relevant paras of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

“2. A fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer

periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society.

3. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case.

4. While so introspecting, among the factors that need to be considered is whether the accused was arrested during investigations when that person perhaps has the best opportunity to tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. If the investigating officer does not find it necessary to arrest an accused person during investigations, a strong case should be made out for placing that person in judicial custody after a charge sheet is filed. Similarly, it is important to ascertain whether the accused was participating in the investigations to the satisfaction of the investigating officer and was not absconding or not appearing when required by the investigating officer. Surely, if an accused is not hiding from the investigating officer or is hiding due to some genuine and expressed fear of being victimised, it would be a factor that a judge would need to consider in an appropriate case. It is also necessary for the judge to consider whether the accused is a first-time offender or has been accused of other offences and if so, the nature of such offences and his or her general conduct. The poverty or the deemed indigent status of an accused is also an extremely important factor and even Parliament has taken notice of it by incorporating an Explanation to section 436 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. An equally soft approach to incarceration has been taken by Parliament by

inserting section 436A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

5. To put it shortly, a humane attitude is required to be adopted by a judge, while dealing with an application for remanding a suspect or an accused person to police custody or judicial custody. There are several reasons for this including maintaining the dignity of an accused person, howsoever poor that person might be, the requirements of Article 21 of the Constitution and the fact that there is enormous overcrowding in prisons, leading to social and other problems as noticed by this Court in In Re-Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons, 2017(4) RCR (Criminal) 416: 2017(5) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 408 : (2017) 10 SCC 658

6. The historical background of the provision for bail has been elaborately and lucidly explained in a recent decision delivered in Nikesh Tara chand Shah v. Union of India, 2017 (13) SCALE 609 going back to the days of the Magna Carta. In that decision, reference was made to Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab, (1980) 2 SCC 565 in which it is observed that it was held way back in Nagendra v. King-Emperor, AIR 1924 Calcutta 476 that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. Reference was also made to Emperor v. Hutchinson, AIR 1931 Allahabad 356 wherein it was observed that grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception. The provision for bail is therefore age-old and the liberal interpretation to the provision for bail is almost a century old, going back to colonial days.

7. However, we should not be understood to mean that bail should be granted in every case. The grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously and in a humane manner and compassionately. Also, conditions for the grant of bail ought not to be so strict as to be incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.”

Therefore, to elucidate further, this Court is conscious of the basic and fundamental principle of law that right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This constitutional right cannot be denied to the accused as is the mandate of the Apex court in “*Hussainara Khatoon and ors (IV) v. Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna*”, (1980) 1 SCC 98. Besides this, reference can be drawn upon that pre-conviction period of the under-trials should be as short as possible keeping in view the nature of accusation and the severity of punishment in case of conviction and the nature of supporting evidence, reasonable apprehension of tampering with the witness or apprehension of threat to the complainant.

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 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 lend the petitioner in a situation of denial the concession of bail.

5. **DECISION:**

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

In the afore-said terms, the present petition is hereby allowed.

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

04.12.2024

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Meenu

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>