



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

209

CRM-M-2960-2026 (O&M)

Decided on : 23.03.2026

Balwinder Kaur

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Mansur Ali, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Tushar Madaan, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral)

This petition is the first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita', 2023. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.134 dated 13.12.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 109, 3(5) [Section 111, 61(2), 253, 308(2) added later on] of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Sadar Rajpura, District Patiala.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Darshan Singh' hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the abovenamed complainant that on 12.12.2025 at about 06:00 P.M. when he was going towards his cattle shed, three young boys with muffled faces came on a motorcycle and one of them took out a pistol from his waist band fired gunshots. It was further stated by the abovenamed complainant that one



of the fired gunshot hit him on the abdomen and thereafter, the abovementioned assailants fled from the spot.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution, during the course of investigation it was found that the accused, namely Sahilpreet Singh, Devinder Singh and Anuj Kumar, were involved in the commission of abovementioned offence.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that the petitioner is a relative of infamous gangster, namely Goldy Dhillon, being the mother of brother-in-law of Goldy Dhillon. According to the prosecution, the petitioner had been playing an active role in harbouring the assailants, and that she was also aware of the crime being committed by them. As per prosecution, with regard to above, the main accused had suffered disclosure statement and pursuant to abovementioned statement, the petitioner has been taken into custody.

5. Custody Certificate has been filed by learned State Counsel. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However, the learned State Counsel has orally opposed the present petition.

6. Heard.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision:-



- i. that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than three months;
- ii. that the petitioner is a 60-year-old lady and therefore, she deserves a considerate view;
- iii. that there is no allegation against the petitioner that she was present on the spot at the time of occurrence, or that she played any active role on the spot;
- iv. that except the disclosure statement there is no other evidence collected by the Investigating Officer against the petitioner, and there is a question mark with regard to admissibility of abovementioned statement in evidence as the co-accused of the petitioner made the abovementioned disclosure statement when they were in custody;
- v. that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- vi. that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vii. that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- viii. 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
- ix. that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

9. In the present case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of "Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another", 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, are 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”.

10. 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”.

11. 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”.

12. 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.



13. 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.

14. 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 furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court. However the abovementioned concession shall be subject to 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.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

23.03.2026
Vinod

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