

239

2025:PHHC:051955



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

**CRM-M-19896-2025
DECIDED ON: 23.04.2025**

YODHA SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: None.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The Punjab & Haryana High Court Bar Association and Bar Council of Punjab & Haryana High Court have decided “**No work day**” for today i.e., 23.04.2025 on account of sudden demise of Sh. Bhupinder Singh Rathore, oldest member of the Bar Council.

2. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 483 BNSS, has been invoked for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 76, dated 05.07.2024, under Sections 341, 324, 148, 149 of IPC, 1860 (Sections 326 of IPC (118(2) of BNS and Section 201 of IPC (238 of BNS) added later on registered at Police Station Majitha, Amritsar.

2. Facts as narrated in the FIR reads as under:-

“Statement of Kanwaljit Singh son of Gursewak Singh resident of village Ludhar, P.S. Majitha, District Amritsar age 25 years mobile No. 86694-03415 states that I am resident of above said address. I

was doing the work of welding. On 22.06.2024 at 10.30 AM I was coming back home after doing the work of Satnam Singh @ Sattu of our village when I reached near the water tank of village Ludhar then there Harman son of Laddu armed with datar, Goni son of Laddu armed with datar, Vishal Sharma armed with Kirpan, Jodha son of Flancha armed with datar and Laddu son of Balwant Singh armed with datar all residents of village Ludhar, P.S. Majitha were already standing with their weapons. When I reached near than all the above said persons surrounded me and Harman gave a lalkara to catch hold. Today I should not go unhurt teach him (me) a lesson for quarreling with us on which all of them attacked with their respective weapons upon me. Goni above said gave blow of datar with intention to kill me on my head I raised both my hands on my head, so the datar hit on my left wrist. Harman above said gave a blow of his datar with intention to kill me on my head and I raised my hands above my head and the datar hit on the little finger of the right hand. Jodha Singh above said gave two blows of datar on my right leg and blow the knee. Vishal Singh above said gave a blow of Kirpan twice on my right knee, Laddu above said gave a blow of his datar on the left knee, Vishal gave the blow of the dasti Kirpan below my left knee, Harman gave a blow of his datar on my right foot on the upper part. Harman gave the blow of datar below the right knee. Jodha gave two blows continuously on below my right knee. Goni gave the blow of the datar on the back side of my right hand. I raised rola of Mar Ditta Mar Ditta then on hearing my rola Teja Singh son of Narender Singh and Maggu son of Major Singh resident of Ludhar came on the spot on seeing them, all the persons fled with their respective weapons. The motive is that all the above said persons had earlier also quarrel with me regarding which I had given an application at Majitha Police Station. Regarding which the respectables had got the matter compromise with respect to the above said grudge all the above said persons has given me injuries with intention to kill me. Action be taken against them. The respectables have been trying for effecting a

compromise between us it could not materialized. I have recorded my statement. Heard it. It is correct Sd/ - Kanwaljit Singh.”

4. It is pleaded in the petition that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and there is unexplained delay of 12 days in lodging the FIR, as the incident took place on 22.06.2024 and the FIR was got registered on 05.07.2024. Perusal of the petition shows that though the injury attributed to the petitioner has been declared grievous in nature, but the same is on the non-vital part of the body i.e., below the right knee of the complainant. It has also been pleaded in the petition that similarly situated co-accused namely Harman Singh has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 24.01.2025 passed in CRM-M-3219-2025.

5. As per custody certificate produced in the Court by the Pervi Officer, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of 8 months and 13 days and is having clean antecedents.

6. Be that as it may, considering the facts that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration of 8 months and 13 days; similarly situated co-accused has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court; the injury attributed to the present petitioner is on the non-vital part of body of the complainant added with the fact that investigation is completed, wherein prosecution has cited as many as 21 prosecution witnesses and charges are yet to be framed, which is sufficient for this Court to infer that the conclusion of trial shall take considerable time and therefore, this Court is of the considered view that detaining the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period would solve no purpose.

7. 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 *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.”

8. 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.

9. 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.

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

11. The petition in the aforesaid terms stands allowed.

12. The Jail Authority, concerned is directed to intimate the said order to the petitioner-accused.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

23.04.2025

Meenu

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