



CRM-M-55748 of 2025

-1-

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

218

CRM-M-55748 of 2025
Date of Decision: 12.12.2025

Rajender Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Daljeet Singh Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, 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.89 dated 09.03.2023 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 325, 307, 302, 341 and 506 of the IPC, at Police Station Ellenabad, District Sirsa.
2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner along with other accused murdered one Gurmeet Singh (son of the complainant) and also gave injuries to his friends, namely, Rohtash and Charanjeet Kumar. Hence, the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor has any concern with the death



CRM-M-55748 of 2025

-2-

of Gumeet Singh. He argued that as per the prosecution, the petitioner was shown to be armed with a baseball stick and as per allegation, he allegedly gave a blow on the head of injured-Charanjeet which is declared simple in nature and not even a single blow has been attributed to him on the person of the deceased-Gurmeet Singh. He further argued that if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, even then no specific role is attributed to the present petitioner and the entire story is based on suspicion and hearsay. Further, co-accused Himanshu Sharma, Sagar @ Kaku, Nirmal Sharma and Sachin have already been granted the concession of regular by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 05.11.2024. He further submits that the petitioner is at parity with said co-accused Sachin. The petitioner is in custody since 25.12.2024. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits that there are total 29 prosecution witnesses and out of them, only 02 have been examined in-chief till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter and while referring to the same, has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. She argued that the petitioner is involved in the heinous crime of murder of Gurmeet Singh (son of the complainant). She further argued that the petitioner, along with other co-accused, was active member of the unlawful assembly. She further argued that the petitioner was duly identified by the complainant and was also seen in the



CRM-M-55748 of 2025

-3-

CCTV footage, which itself shows the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. She has further submitted that the petitioner is involved in one more case meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

5. 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 11 months; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges framed; out of 29 witnesses, only 02 have been examined in-chief till date; the trial is proceeding at snail's pace, and will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has held 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*".

7. The foundational concept of the criminal jurisprudence is to ensure speedy trial. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has repeatedly reiterated that right to speedy trial is enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Speedy trial would cover investigation, enquiry, trial, appeal, revision and retrial etc. i.e. everything starting with the accusation against the accused and expiring with the final verdict of the last Court.



CRM-M-55748 of 2025

-4-

8. In this regard, reference is being made to the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the context of right to speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution of India on the following decision:- ***Akhtari Bi Vs. State of M.P., (2001) 4 SCC 355, Surinder Singh Alias Shingara Singh Vs. State of Punjab, (2005) SCC (Crl) 1674, P. Ramachandra Rao Vs. State of Karnataka, (2002) 4 SCC 578, Babu Singh and others Vs. State of U.P., (1978) 1 SCC 579, Takht Singh and others Vs. State of M.P., (2001) 10 SCC 463; Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No.2356 of 2010, Kushal Singh Vs. State of U.P. (2JJ.) and Fazal Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh, (2012) 5 SCC 752.***

9. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

**CRM-M-55748 of 2025****-5-**

10. 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.

12.12.2025*D.Bansal***(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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