



CRM-M-4452-2025 (O&M)

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-4452-2025 (O&M)****Reserved on : 04.11.2025****Pronounced on : 07.11.2025**

Jasbir @Sonu

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,
Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocate and
Mr. Pranav Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 120B, 201, 302, 324, 341 and 34 of Indian Penal Code, the FIR No.104 dated 18.04.2021 has been lodged in Police Station Sahlawas, District Jhajjar. The petitioner is being prosecuted for the commission of abovementioned offence and he has been arrested. The petitioner is in custody and, therefore, craving for bail. This is first petition for bail filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the statement of Om Parkash, who alleged that his cousin brother, namely Dharmender, was going home on his tractor-



trolley, and that on the way when he crossed the street in front of the house of Sonu son of Bhagwana, his tractor was stopped by Sonu and Ramesh on the pretext of using the abovementioned street. According to complainant, both Sonu and Ramesh caught hold of Dharmender and assaulted him. It was further alleged by the complainant that during attack, Sonu used a knife and inflicted injuries on the person of Dharmender. The complainant further stated that at the time of incident, Naveen son of Jorawar, who was passing through the street, tried to rescue Dharmender, but he, too, came under attack and suffered injuries. As per complainant, there were other persons also, who assisted Sonu at the spot, but due to darkness, he could not identify them. As per complainant, in the said incident, his brother Dharmender succumbed to his injuries and passed away.

3. Heard.

4. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that the story set-out by the prosecution is unnatural, and improbable. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already suffered a lot of incarceration for being in custody for a period of almost four and a half year, and that the petitioner has clean antecedents. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, except the matrimonial dispute, the petitioner has no other criminal case pending against him.

5. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that the petitioner is already facing protracted trial for the last more than four and a half years, and that the trial is proceeding at a very



snail pace, as out of 39 prosecution witnesses only 21 have been examined so far. It has also been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that one of the star witnesses of the prosecution, i.e. eye-witness Manoj, has already been examined, and he has not supported the prosecution case. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, there is a debatable question in this case as to whether the alleged offence comes within the purview of Sections 302 or 304 IPC.

6. *Per contra*, the learned State Counsel has argued that the petitioner is entitled for bail, as he was responsible for the death of a human being without any provocation. As per learned State Counsel in the present case, the eye-witnesses, other than Manoj, have supported the prosecution case. While claiming that the trial is proceeding at a reasonably good pace, the learned State Counsel has argued that there is no delay in the present trial.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration, before arriving at any decision with regard to present petition for bail: -

- i) that the petitioner has already suffered a lot of incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than 04 years and 05 months;
- ii) that all the private witnesses have already been examined, and large number of witnesses, i.e. 18 in number, are yet to be examined;



- iii) that one of the eye-witnesses has not supported the prosecution case;
- iv) that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents;
- v) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- vi) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vii) that detention of petitioner in judicial lockup is not likely to serve any purpose; and
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses.

9. With regard to the legal aspect involved in the instant case, it is relevant to mention that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "***Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another***", 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, has observed that "*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. 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”.

10. The principles laid down by the Hon’ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of **‘Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another’**, 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 577, are also relevant in this case. In the abovementioned case, it has been observed that *“the rate of conviction in criminal cases in India is abysmally low. It appears to us that this factor weighs on the mind of the Court while deciding the bail applications in a negative sense. Courts tend to think that the possibility of a conviction being nearer to rarity, bail applications will have to be decided strictly, contrary to legal principles. We cannot mix up consideration of a bail application, which is not punitive in nature with that of a possible adjudication by way of trial. On the contrary, an ultimate acquittal with continued custody would be a case of grave injustice”.*

11. Recently, in the case of **‘Tapas Kumar Palit Vs. State of Chhattisgarh’**, 2022 INSC 222, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India has observed that *“if an accused is to get a final verdict after incarceration of six to seven years in jail as an undertrial prisoner, then, definitely, it could be*



said that his right to have a speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution has been infringed”. It has also been observed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the abovementioned case that “delays are bad for the accused and extremely bad for the victims, for Indian society and for the credibility of our justice system, which is valued. Judges are the masters of their Courtrooms and the Criminal Procedure Code provides many tools for the Judges to use in order to ensure that cases proceed efficiently”.

12. 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 mandated by Hon’ble Apex court in “***Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and Another***”, ***SLP (Crl.) No.8523/2024***.

13. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

14. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby allowed. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court, subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) that the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.



- (ii) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change in address to the trial Court, till the conclusion of trial; and
- (iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial Court.

15. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 07, 2025
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No