



CRM-M-55570-2025 (O&M)

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-55570-2025 (O&M)****Reserved on : 06.11.2025****Pronounced on : 10.11.2025**

Rinku

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by: Mr. Jai Vir Yadav, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Tapan Kumar Yadav, Advocate,
Mr. Sakeel Ahmad, Advocate and
Ms. Himanshi Gautam, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Section 25(1B)(a) and 27(1) of the Arms Act, and Sections 115, 127(2), 133, 140(3), 3(5), 351(3), 61(2) and 111(2)(b) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, the FIR No.40 dated 22.02.2025 has been lodged in Sushant Lok, District Gurugram. 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 first 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 on a complaint, submitted by Rahul S/o Sita Ram,

**CRM-M-55570-2025 (O&M)**

2

hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that he was working as a Security Head (Bouncer) with Inderjit Yadav, and that for certain works, Inderjit Yadav used to take services of additional Bouncers, and for that purpose, he (complainant) used to charge Rs.2,000/- per bouncer from Inderjit Yadav. According to complainant, in the office of his employer Inderjit Yadav, Navneet @Chotte, Joginder @Kale, Vikas and Rinku were also working for taking care of financial activities of Inderjit Yadav. It was alleged by the complainant that when Navneet @Chhote and Joginder @Kale came to know about his commission, they informed Inderjit Yadav, and therefore, he got annoyed.

3. According to complainant, in view of abovementioned development, Inderjit Yadav called him to a spot near Taj Hotel, Sector-44, Gurugram, and when he reached there, on gun-point, Navneet @Chotte, Joginder @Kale, Vikas, Rinku and Pahari forced him to sit in the car, tied him with clothes and took to a room, where his clothes were removed and burn injuries were inflicted on his person with cigarette butts. It was stated by the complainant that in the abovementioned incident, video was also prepared by Joginder @Kale, and when he lost conscious, he was abandoned by the above-named assailants.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of abovementioned complaint, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. During the course of investigation, the accused have been arrested.

5. Heard.

**CRM-M-55570-2025 (O&M)**

3

6. The record has been perused carefully.
7. 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 with regard to present petition for bail: -
- i) that all the offences for which the petitioner has been charged, except the offence under Section 111 of BNS are triable by the Court of Sessions.
 - ii) That although Section 111(2) of BNS has been invoked in this case, but the custody certificate, placed on record, shows that except for an offence under Section 307 IPC, the petitioner has not been booked for any other offence in the past;
 - iii) That the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 06 months and 05 days;
 - iv) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
 - v) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
 - vi) that detention of petitioner in judicial lockup is not likely to serve any purpose;
 - vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner 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 petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.
8. With regard to the legal aspect involved in the instant case, the relevant law has been 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, 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”.

9. 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”.

10. 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*”.

11. 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.



CRM-M-55570-2025 (O&M)

6

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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

NOVEMBER 10, 2025

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No