

2024:PHHC:171990



225

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-62925-2024
DECIDED ON: 20.12.2024**

ANKUSH**.....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Bhisham Kumar Majoka, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG Haryana

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**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.200 dated 15.04.2024, under Section 25 of Arms Act and Sections 120-B, 148, 149, 307, 506 of IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station Kharkhauda, District Sonipat (Section 120-B of IPC was added later on).

2. Prosecution story set up in the present case as per the version in the FIR reads as under :-

“To, Station House Officer, Police Station Kharkhauda (Sonipat). Sir, it is stated that I am Bharpur son of Shri Rajbir, resident of Sisana-2, I do agricultural work. Today on dated 14/04/2024 at about 10 pm, I and my younger brother Sukhpal

and other family members were present at home, then I heard a sound calling my brother Sukhpal from the street in front of the house. I opened the door of my house and saw that 5 boys were standing in the street in front of my house, out of which 4 boys were Rahul son of Jai Bhagwan resident of Sisana-2, Nishu son of Amarjeet resident of Sisana-1, Vikku resident of Sisana-2, Bhola resident of Sisana-2 and another boy who had covered his face. When I asked them about the matter, they said that they wanted to shoot my brother Sukhpal. At that very moment, my brother Sukhpal also came to the gate of the house. Upon seeing Sukhpal, Rahul, Nishu, Vikku and Bhola said that Sukhpal has also come, now he should be shot. As soon as they said this, the boy with his face covered took out a pistol from his shirt and fired at my brother Sukhpal with the intention of killing him. My brother Sukhpal narrowly escaped. I pushed them and took my brother Sukhpal inside the house and closed the gate. Those boys pushed the gate as well. After hearing the gunshot, people from the neighbourhood came. But all the boys threatened them and fled from the spot with their weapons. About a month ago, Vikku and Nishu, along with their other friends, had attacked our neighbour Rakesh, son of Krishna. My brother Sukhpal had asked Nishu why he had beaten Rakesh. Holding a grudge for this, Rahul, Nishu, Vikku, Bhola and another boy attacked my brother Sukhpa with the intention to kill, action should be taken against them. Sd/- BHARPOOR 7082822524.”

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 it is a case of no injury and recovery of pistol has already been effected, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars. He has drawn attention of this Court to an order dated 27.05.2024

(Annexure P-2) passed in CRM-M-27100-2024 vide which co-accused

namely Manesh Dahiya has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

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 involved in other case, meaning thereby he is a habitual offender. He submits that the recovery of pistol has already been effected.

4. Analysis

Considering the submissions made by the petitioner that the petitioner has already suffered sufficient incarceration i.e. 8 months and 2 days and recovery of pistol admittedly has already been effected and as per the principle of the criminal jurisprudence, no one should be considered guilty, till the guilt is proved beyond reasonable doubt, whereas in the instant case challan stands not presented to the Court and total 31 prosecution witnesses are to be examined, which is sufficient for this Court to infer that the conclusion of trial shall take considerable time and detaining the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period would solve no purpose.

Reliance can be placed upon the judgment of the Apex Court rendered in “***Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another***”, 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, wherein it has been held that the grant of bail is a general rule and putting persons in jail or in prison or in correction home is an exception. 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 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 aforesaid discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

The petition in the aforesaid terms stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

20.12.2024

Meenu

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