

2024:PHHC:151722



217

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-56667-2024
DECIDED ON: 20.11.2024

PARVESH LAURA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Satbir Singh Kanwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Relief Sought

The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 has been invoked for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 4, dated 03.01.2024, under Sections 120-B, 201, 302, 34 of IPC, 1860 and Section 25(1b) of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Sector 14, Gurugram.

2. Facts

Facts as narrated in the FIR reads as under:-

“To, SHO PS Sector-14 Gurugram Naina Pahuja D/o Ashok Kumar Pahuja resident of 226/21 Lane no 158 Baldev nagar near Pataudi Chowki Want to Complaint against Abhijeet Balraj in regard to murder of my sister Divya Pahuja. She was last went to meet Abhijeet on 01.01.2024 and was last active on call on 2nd Jan 2024 by 11.50 AM. We tried to contact her phones but her number was not reachable then went to Abhijeet house located in South Ext-1-21 2nd Floor New Delhi where his friend Balraj was present and was having Divya's phone. I collected the phone and reached to Abhijeet Gurgaon hotel where my sister was last present. We requested him to show us the Cameras but

he kept on denying and arguing with me. In last I called police and they investigated. I found my sister blazer in Abhijeet hotel and when I was Coming back from his hotel he handed me over my sister Divya Debit card and pan card saying she left it with him, where I felt more fishy. In investigation I found blood Stains on floor and her ring, shoes, sperticals in Abhijeet Store room. Abhijeet house keepers helped him disposing the body of Divya. House keepers name is Hemraj and Prakash. Abhijeet also offered people 10 Lakhs to get rid of the body. Anup his partner also helped him decomposing the body. Divya was the witness in Sandeep Gadoli case and we have full Surety that Sandeep Sister and his brother gave money to Abhijeet for the Murder. We request respected police to investigate Sudesh Kataria and Bharmha Prakash Kataria in this Matter in CCTV clips it is clearly Visible that Abhijeet killed Divya and wrapped her in a white Sheet and stored her body in his BMW blue car no DD03K2400 It is also clear that one lady with boy haircut and wearing black white sweater is also involved in this Murder case. We request police to take a strict action against them. I registered The FIR in Sector- 14 police station in presence of my mother Sonia Pahuja today i.e., 03.01.24”

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 2nd disclosure statement suffered by main accused namely Abhijeet, wherein the role attributed to the petitioner is of supplying 3 country made pistols and 40 rounds to the main accused Abhijeet and that pistol was used in the commissioning of the offence. He further contends that petitioner is just being made scapegoat as the main person, who is said to have supplied the weapons is not apprehended till date, therefore, the case of the prosecution is based on fictitious and false allegations, as the recovery whatsoever has not been effected from the petitioner but from the other co-accused persons.

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 the petitioner is a habitual offender, as he is involved in other cases also, but could not produce any material to connect him with the commissioning of offence.

4. **Analysis**

Considering the custody period already suffered by the petitioner i.e., 10 months and 6 days and no specific role has been attributed him except he has delivered three country made pistols and 40 rounds to main accused added with the fact that investigation is complete, challan stands presented on 01.04.2024, charges stands framed on 07.06.2024 and out of total 50 prosecution witnesses only 1 has been examined so far, meaning thereby conclusion of trial shall take considerable time, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period, which would curtail right of the petitioner 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.

20.11.2024

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

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