



CRM-M-44181 of 2025

-1-

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

219

CRM-M-44181 of 2025
Date of Decision: 04.09.2025

Kuldeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. V.S. Rathee, Advocate
or the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.34 dated 01.04.2025 registered under Section 309(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station G.R.P. Panipat, District GRP Ambala Cantt.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that as per the prosecution, on 31.03.2025, petitioner along with other co-accused, namely, Punjab Singh and Parduman Singh @ Daman, committed the act of robbery by snatching the purses of the complainant and his friend Mohd. Muzafar in which cash amount of Rs.12,000/- and Rs.8000/- along with their Aadhar Card were lying and fled away from the spot.

**CRM-M-44181 of 2025****-2-**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that the said incident took place on 31.03.2025 and the FIR in question was registered on 01.04.2025 i.e. after a delay of one day. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The petitioner is in custody since 03.04.2025. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented. Further both the said co-accused, Punjab Singh and Praduman Singh, who were indulged in this crime with the petitioner, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 22.07.2025. He further submits that the trial may take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petitioner, filed custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is a first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 05 months, investigation is complete; challan stands presented, and the trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. Keeping the petitioner

**CRM-M-44181 of 2025****-3-**

in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. This Court is sanguine of the fact that according to the proposition settled by the Apex Court in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

04.09.2025*D.Bansal***(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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