



CRM-M-11066-2025 (O&M)

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-11066-2025 (O&M)****Reserved on : 04.11.2025****Pronounced on : 10.11.2025**

Amit Kumar @Dhruv Dhurup Kumar

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by: Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 364A and 34 of Indian Penal Code and Section 25 of Arms Act, the FIR No.93 dated 24.08.2021 has been lodged in Police Station Mohkampura, Police Commisionerate Amritsar. 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 second petition for bail filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. The earlier bail petition filed by the petitioner was not decided on merits, rather it was dismissed as withdrawn.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the statement of Kailash Chaudhary, who stated that on 23.08.2021, his younger brother, namely Pintu Kumar, did not return home, and that on 24.08.2021 at about 09:00 am, he received a ransom call

**CRM-M-11066-2025 (O&M)**

2

from mobile No.7347478115, whereby he was instructed to arrange a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- by 12:00 noon. According to complainant, the abovementioned person had kidnapped his younger brother, namely Pintu Kumar, and therefore, a request was made by him to the police for taking appropriate action.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in response to abovementioned complaint, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation, the victim was recovered and the accused apprehended.

4. Heard.

5. It has been argued on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner has already suffered a lot of incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than 04 years and 2 months, and that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the former petition moved by the petitioner was not decided on merits, and that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition, way back on 02.05.2024, there is no significant progress in the trial. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, out of 21 prosecution witnesses, only 06 have been examined so far.

6. *Per contra*, the learned State Counsel has argued that allegations against the petitioner are for the commission of very serious offence, i.e. kidnapping for ransom, and that already 06 prosecution witnesses have been examined in the present case, and 04 have been given up. As per learned State Counsel, only 11 prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined, and that this allegation of the petitioner is false that there is no



CRM-M-11066-2025 (O&M)

3

significant progress in the trial. It has also been contended by learned State Counsel that from the date of dismissal of former bail petition, there is no change in circumstances.

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, for 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 02 months;
- ii) that despite dismissal of former bail petition, i.e. way back on 02.05.2024, the trial has not been concluded so far, and it seems that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future also;
- iii) the petitioner has no criminal antecedents;
- iv) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- v) that detention of petitioner in judicial lockup is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

9. With regard to the legal aspect involved in the instant case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of

“Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another”, 2018(2) R.C.R.



(Criminal) 131, are relevant, wherein it has been 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.

**CRM-M-11066-2025 (O&M)**

6

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 final decision of the 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 10, 2025

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No