



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

CRM-M-29926-2025

Date of Decision:02.07.2025

DINESH KUMAR ALIAS SUNNY

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Jasinder S. Sekhon, 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 FIR No. 83 dated 14.05.2024 under sections 379 (B) (2), 341, 324, 307 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Garhshankar, Hoshiarpur.

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

“Batement of Raj Kumar son of Batu Ram, resident of Ward No. 9, Garhshankar, Mohalla Paisriya. Potice Sration Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur. aged approximately 55 years, Mobile No. 77105-69571 stated that I am a resident of the above-mentioned address and I run Rana Bakery at Banga Check. Garhshankar. On 12.05.2024, at around 10:00 PM. after closing my shop, I was riding my scooter and carrying the day's sale amounting to approximately Rs. 90,000, a tablet, an HDFC bank cheque book, and other documents in my bag. When I reached Joshi Dairy. Mohalla Paesria, I saw a Swift Dzire car bearing registration No. PB-07-BZ-3056 parked ahead. On the driver's seat was Satnam Singh @ Sattu son of Jagdev Singh, resident of Ward No. 1, Rawalpindi Road, Garhshankar, whom I already know. The person



sitting wrat in him in the passenger seat suddenly gotow and scopped my webster With the notion of ling we he attacked me with a kirpan, striking me on the right side of my head. The second blow of Kirpan was made on my shoulder which hit the palm of might left hand, and the third strike landed on the thumb of my right hand. I raised an alarm shouting "Mar Ditta Mar Ditta That unidentified person snatched my bag containing Rs. 90,000/-, a tablet, an HDFC cheque book, and other documents and fled. Satnam Singh@ Sattu made him sit in the Swift car and drove off toward the Banga Road side. I immediately called my son, who took me to Ramanpreet Hospital, Chandigarh Road, Garhshankar for treatment. The doctor administered stitches and after providing treatment. discharged me to go home. Satnam Singh @ Sattu, in conspiracy with his accomplice, attacked me with the intention to kill and committed robbery. Strict legal action should be taken against the accused.

Submitted by: Sd/ Raj Kumar Sd/ Prince Rana
(witness) Verified by: Lakhvir Singh, ASI, Police Station
Garhshankar Date: 13.05.2024.

Police Proceedings: On 13.05.2024, MHC of Police Station received a written complaint at police station from Raj Kumar son of Babu Ram, resident of Ward No. 2, Garhshankar, Mohalla Paesria, Police Station Garhshankar, Diner Hoshiarpu mjuries sustained and admitted regarding the to Ramanpreet Hospital, Chandigarh Road, Garhshankar and for taking action and handed over the same to me ASL E ASI along with police party reached Ramanpreet Hospital and obtained a written medico-legal opinion from the attending doctor, who stated that after providing primary medical aid, the injured was sent home. Accordingly, Rapat No. 19 dated 13.05.2024 was made in the daily diary at the police station.

1. ASI was present in the police station that injured Raj Kumar son of Babu Ram above said, along with his son Prince Rana, appeared at the police station before me, and got recorded his above-stated statement in writing to me. His statement was read over and explained to him. The medico-legal report mentions four injuries: injury No. 1 is advised CT Scan, and injuries No. 2, 3, and 4 are advised X-ray. From the contents of the statement and



medical report, offences under Sections 379-B(2), 341, 324, 307, 120-B IPC are made out. Accordingly, the matter is being handed over in writing to the MHC of the police station for registration of FIR. After registering the FIR, its number be informed, and the Control Room be notified. Special reports shall also be dispatched. I, ASI along with complainant and PHG Amarjeet Kumar No. 26688 left for the spot to inspect the scene of crime. Sd/- ASI Lakhvir Singh Police Station Garhshankar Date: 13.05.2024 Time of arrival at spot: 11:00 PM. At the Police Station: On receipt of the above said writing in the police station, the FIR under above said offences Was registered and the original writing and copy of FIR are being handed over to PHG Ajay Kumar No. 26745 for handing over the same to the assigned ASI at the spot for investigation. Wireless communication has been sent to higher officials and Control Room. Special reports are being prepared and dispatched to the concerned Area Magistrate and senior officers via Constable Cham Singh No. 1236/HPR.

3. **Contentions**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused as he was not named in the FIR. He further states that there is unexplained delay of two days in lodging the instant FIR as the occurrence took place on 12.05.2024 whereas the instant FIR got registered on 14.05.2024. The petitioner is in custody since 22.05.2024.

On behalf of the State

On the other hand, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner today in Court, which is taken on record. He seeks dismissal of the instant petition on the ground that the petitioner



was part of the group and played active role in the alleged commissioning of the offence. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in other cases.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the custody period i.e. 01 year 01 month and 07 days for which the petitioner has suffered incarceration; in addition to the fact that alleged injuries suffered by the complainant at the hands of the petitioner are simple in nature, investigation is complete, challan stands presented to Court on 12.08.2024, charges have been framed on 26.09.2024 and total 17 prosecution witnesses have been cited and none has been examined till date, 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 (CrI.) 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