

2024:PHHC:151716



216

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-56607-2024
DECIDED ON: 20.11.2024

KARAN KUMAR ALIAS KANNU

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Jasraj Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Relief Sought

The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 BNSS, has been invoked for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 01, dated 04.01.2024, under Sections 302, 34 of IPC, 1860 and Section 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 307, 212, 201, 120-B of IPC added during investigation), registered at Police Station Bullowal, District Hoshiarpur.

2. Facts

Facts as narrated in the FIR reads as under:-

“Statemet of Amrik Singh son of Satpal Singh r/o of Dadiana Kalan P.S. Haryana District Hoshiarpur aged approximately 57 years Phone No.: 946377-8536. Stated that I am residnet of abvoe said address and does Agricutual job. Today dated 04.01.2024 I along with my brother Sandeep.

Kumar Sarpnach @ China son of Satpal Singh r/o Dadiana Kalan P.S. Haryana. came to our tiles dump stand Dusarka. Then at about 10:00 Am 3 young men on a black. colour motorcycle, out of which one was Anoop Kumar @ Vicky son of Ashwani Kumar I/o Asalpur P.S Bullowal and other 2 unknown persons 24/25 years came to our Tiles Stand, when my brother Sandeep Kumar came out our office after paying obeisance then Anoop Kumar @ Vicky fired on my brother Sandeep Kumar with his pistol, which was hit upon right side of my brother sandeep • Kumar chest thus my brother Sandeep Kumar fell on the ground. Then. Anoop Kumar fired 3 gunshots towards Satbir Singh son of Harpal Singh r/o Dade Baba Mohar Singh, Jiwan Singh son of Tarsem Lal r/o Dadiana Kalan and Deep Singh son of Ashok Kumar r/o Husainpur Gurka P.s. Bullowal, who were present there. Then Anoop Singh friends who were armed with Dattar waived there weapons in the air and fled away from the spot on their motorcycle along with their weapons while abusing my brother Sandeep Kumar Sarpanch. I with the help of my friends took my brother Sandeep Kumar to KDM Hospital Hoshiarpur. There Dr. Sahib Checked my brother and decalred him dead. Then I got my brother Sandeep Kumar deadbody kept in Civil Hospital Hoshiapru Mourtuary kindly take an action against abvoe said accused persons. Statement is recorded with you.. It is read heard and correct. Sd/- Amrik Singh.”

3. Contentions:

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused namely Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that neither any active role has been assigned to him nor injury has been attributed to him upon the persons of deceased. He further submits that during the investigation, nothing has been recovered from the present petitioner to connect him with the commissioning of offence.

On behalf of the State

Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He prays for dismissal of the present petition

stating that the petitioner is a part of conspiracy averred in the challan, though he could not controvert the fact that no recovery was effected from the present petitioner during investigation.

4. **Analysis**

Considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner i.e., 10 months and 1 day and is not involved in any other case, as is evident from the perusal of the custody certificate; investigation is complete, wherein conclusion of trial shall take considerable time as out of 30 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined after framing of charges on 21.09.2024 so far, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars for uncertain period, wherein “*bail is a rule and jail is an exception*” and it would also violate the principle of right to speedy trial and expeditious disposal under Article 21 of 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 Nimesh 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.

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.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

20.11.2024

Meenu

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