

2024:PHHC:167207



215

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-61786-2024
DECIDED ON: 13.12.2024

AJAY

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Ranbir Singh Rawat, Advocate and
Mr. Ashwani Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Relief Sought

The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 has been invoked seeking regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 265, dated 16.09.2024, under Sections 110, 115, 118(1), 126, 190, 191(3), 351(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Rohtak Sadar, District Rohtak.

2. Facts

Facts as narrated in the FIR reads as under:-

“To the Chowki Incharge Gilod. Sir, it is submitted that I Priyawart @ Ravi son of Surender resident of Rital Phoghat, District Rohtak. I am running a grocery shop in the village on 14.09.2024 at about 8 PM I was going to my field on my motorcycle no. HR-77D- 9842, when I reached near Shiv Mandir in my village there Saurabh son of Sita Ram, Anu Rana son of Bijender, Ajay Rana son of

Bijender, Neeraj @ Jallad son of Jai Parkash, Bijender son of Kala, Ajay @ Tind son of Rohtash, Golu son of Narender, Prince son of Sonu resident of Rital Phoghat, District Rohtak who were already having the enmity with me were having wooden stick, sword, farsa and axe in their hands. They got stopped by motorcycle and started abusing me and attacked me, Neeraj @ Jallad was armed with Farsa, Ajay Rana son of Bijender having Danda, Anu Rana was armed with sword and Saurabh armed with Farsa, Prince son of Sonu was having Danda, Bitu and Golu son of Narender was armed with wooden sticks, Bitu and Ajay son of Rohtash was armed with wooden sticks and started beating me. I fallen from the motorcycle and they attached me with wooden sticks, farsa and swords. I shouted Bachao Bachao, information my cousin namely son of Dayal Singh reached at the place and thereafter, above mentioned boys ran away along with their alleged weapons after threatening me to kill. Thereafter, Mandeep son of Dayal Singh arranged a vehicle and brought me Oscar Hospital, Rohtak for treatment where I am under treatment. Legal action be taken against Neeraj, Ajay Rana, Anu Rana, Saurabh, Prince, Golu, Ajay @ Tind, Bijender. ”

3. **Contentions:**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the allegations levelled against him are absolutely false, vague and not supported by any cogent evidence. It is further submitted on behalf of the petitioner that there is a contradictory statement given by complainant, wherein at first instance, the petitioner was stated to have been carrying a danda, but in the second statement, the said version stands changed to the extent that the petitioner was holding a farsa.

On behalf of the State

Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He could not put forth any incriminating material to connect the petitioner with the alleged commissioning of offence.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the fact that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration of 2 months and 24 days and not involved in any other case, as is evident from the perusal of the custody certificate, meaning thereby he is a person of clean antecedents added with the fact that investigation is complete, challan stands presented on 09.11.2024, charges are yet to be framed and 16 prosecution witnesses are to be examined, 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 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

13.12.2024

Meenu

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