



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

07

**CRM-M-54722-2025
Reserved on: 06.11.2025
Pronounced on : 07.11.2025**

SAFI @ MOHD SAFI

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Rohit Rana, Advocate &
Mohd. Arshad, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Arun Singh Rai, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 115, 351(3), 109(1) (Section 117(2) BNS-2023 added later on), the FIR No.44 dated 20.03.2025, has been lodged in Police Station Nagina, District Nuh. With regard to commission of above mentioned offence, the petitioner has been arrested. He is in custody, and therefore, craving for the concession of bail. This is first petition for bail filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of BNSS.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the complaint of complainant Zafaruddin son of Kamruddin hereinafter being referred to as complainant only. According to



complainant from his shop some grocery items, and fodder for animal, were purchased by Ayub son of Amin but he did not pay money and kept on avoiding the payment on one pretext or the other. According to complainant on 07.03.2025 when he demanded money from Ayub, he refused to pay the same and threatened the complainant to teach a lesson if demand would be raised again.

3. The complainant further alleged that on 08.03.2025, when he was going home, on the way near the house of Ayub son of Ratti, the above-named accused (Ayub son of Amin) alongwith Sadiq, Arif and Mustaq launched an attack upon him with the help of wooden handle & iron rods, and they were later on joined by Amina, Tauhid, Qasid, Kamruddin and Rihana. It was alleged by the petitioner that attack on his person was caused with an intention to kill him and that, he had sought help from the police by dialing No.112. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of above-mentioned complaint formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

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, before arriving at any decision with regard to present petition for bail: -

- i) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 05 months and 25 days;
- ii) that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital;
- iii) that the investigation in this case is already complete and the challan has been filed in the Court;
- iv) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of



petitioner;

- v) that as per custody certificate the petitioner has clean antecedents and he has never been prosecuted for any other offence;
- vi) that the injury attributed to the petitioner is simple and the injury declared to be dangerous to life has been attributed to co-accused Zafaruddin;
- vii) that cross version has also been registered by the police and in the above-mentioned cross-version the accused belonging to opposite party have been released on bail;
- viii) that detention of petitioner in judicial lockup is not likely to serve any purpose;
- ix) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- x) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses;
- xi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not co-operate/participate in the trial.

7. With regard to the legal aspect involved in the instant case, it is relevant to mention that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "***Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another***", 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, has 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 LiveLaw (SC) 577, 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**’, 2022 INSC 222, 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"***, SLP (Crl.) No.8523/2024.

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 disposal of the case; 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

07.11.2025

vipin

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