



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

CRM-M-29755-2025

Date of Decision:02.07.2025

HIRA SINGH ALIAS DIAMOND

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. H.S. Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (Oral)

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 220 dated 19.08.2023 for offences punishable under sections 302, 34 & 120-B of IPC & Sections 25, 27 & 29 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“Statement of Manni wife of Ramsharan resident of Near Ashu Club Gaushala Road, Jandiala Guru, District Amritsar age about 35 years, 6280451391 that I am the resident of the above said address and do the domestic work. I have five children from them four are boys and one is girl. Girl is about 3 years old. My husband Ramsharan is a labouror, who today went to the house of his brother Satpal Singh alongwith his younger daughter in his car bearing no. HR 02 P 2842 make Zen Color Gray in ward no. 7. When my husband today at time about 12 AM came back at the door of his house in his car then my daughter was with him then after hearing the noise of the horn, I opened the door of my house then while seeing by me, four unknown persons on two



motorcycles from them two were holding the pistols and by coming started to shoot my husband Ramsharan Singh while sitting in the car. After crossing the bullets from the front glass and side hit approximately 5-6 bullets to my husband. My husband already make my daughter sit towards foot. I raised voice in loud manner maar ditta maar ditta then the above said unknown persons alongwith their weapons fled away from the spot on their motorcycles. Reason behind the grudge is that my husband had fallen in the bad company and due to that he had relations with bad kind of persons from them today somebody have fired the shots upon my husband. We were taking my husband Ramsharan to the hospital for treatment. Who has died on the way. Whose dead body is lying in Guru Ramdass Hospital, Vallah. I by leaving my son Gagandeep Singh near the dead body was coming alongwith my elder brother in law Satpal Singh to give the information to you but you have met near the gate of the hospital. By searching the unknown persons. Appropriate legal action may be taken. Statement has been got recorded to you, heard, it is correct. RTI Manni.

3. **Contentions**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not been named in the present FIR. He further submits that the he was roped in this FIR on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused recorded while in police custody. He further submits that apart from being the alleged member of the gang of co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Happy Jatt, there is no incriminating evidence on record that links the petitioner to the alleged occurrence.

On behalf of the State

On the other hand, learned State Counsel appearing on advance



notice, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. According to which, the petitioner is behind bars for 1 year, 9 months and 04 days

Learned State Counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail stating that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in one more FIR but is not in a position to controvert the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the custody period i.e. 1 year, 9 months and 04 days for which the petitioner has suffered incarceration; similarly situated co-accused has already been granted concession of bail by this Court (Annexures P-5 to P-8), no recovery has been effected from him and he was nominated in the present FIR on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused and as per the principle of the criminal jurisprudence, no one should be considered guilty, till the guilt is proved beyond reasonable doubt, in addition to the fact that investigation is complete, challan stands presented to Court on 24.11.2023, charges have been framed on 06.09.2024 and total 26 prosecution witnesses have been cited out of which only 01 has been examined, which is suffice for this Court to infer that the conclusion of trial will take long time for which the petitioner cannot be detained behind the bars for an indefinite period.

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.”

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 ***Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and another***”, SLO (Crl.) No. 8523/2024. Relevant paras of the said judgment reads as under:-

“7. An accused has a right to a fair trial and while a hurried trial is frowned upon as it may not give sufficient time to prepare for the defence, an inordinate delay in conclusion of the trial would infringe the right of an accused guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution.

8. It is not for nothing the Author Oscar Wilde in “The Ballad of Reading Gaol”, wrote the following poignant lines while being incarcerated:

*“I know not whether Laws be right,
Or whether Laws be wrong;
All that we know who be in jail
Is that the wall is strong;
And that each day is like a year,
A year whose days are long.”*

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 land the petitioner in a situation of denial of concession of bail.

5. **DECISION:**

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on his 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

02.07.2025

kv

Whether speaking/reasoned : ***Yes/No***
Whether reportable : ***Yes/No***