



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

238

CRM-M-52767-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 08.12.2025

Jatinder Kumar @Patwari

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Rahul Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (oral)

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 323, 324, 307, 379-B, 148 and 149 of Indian Penal Code (charges framed under Sections 148, 149, 307, 326, 324, and 394 of IPC), the FIR No.164 dated 22.12.2016 has been lodged in Police Station Sadar Hoshiarpur, District Hoshiarpur. 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 third petition for bail filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of Dilbagh Singh @Baggi, hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on 16.12.2016 at about 10:30 am, he along with friend



Vikas Bhatti @Viki had gone to a service station for the washing of his car, where the petitioner came and noticed that the complainant was there. According to complainant, thereafter he called his friends on mobile phone and they arrived at the spot in a car driven by the petitioner. It is the case of the complainant, thereafter the abovementioned assailants launched an attack upon the complainant with deadly weapons and inflicted injuries on his person.

3. The learned State Counsel has already filed custody certificate of the petitioner. Short reply has already been filed by the State.

4. Heard.

5. The record has been perused carefully.

6. 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: -

- i) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 02 years and 04 months;
- ii) that the statement of complainant, namely Dilbagh Singh, has been recorded on 26.11.2025 in this case, and as per complainant, the petitioner was not involved in the abovementioned incident;
- iii) that other co-accused have already been tried and acquitted with regard to the same case;
- iv) that out of 18 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined so far;
- v) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;



- vi) that detention of the petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioners may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioners will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

7. In the present 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 also 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”.

8. 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) 10 SCC 51**, 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”.*

9. Recently, in the case of **‘Tapas Kumar Palit Vs. State of Chhattisgarh’, 2025 SCC Online SC 322**, 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”.

10. 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***”, 2024 SCC Online SC 4354.

11. 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.

12. 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.



13. 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

08.12.2025

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No