



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

105

CRM-M-5550-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 25.02.2026

Pooja Rani @Pooja

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. C.S. Rana, Advocate and
Mr. Amandeep Singh Mann, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This petition for bail is first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.133 dated 18.06.2024, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 302, 379, 452, 506, 148, 149, 201, and 380 of Indian Penal Code, Police Station City Jagraon, Ludhiana Rural.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Harpreet Kaur', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that on 17.06.2024, she along with her husband Jasvir Singh was present at her home, where, at about 11:00 am, a group comprising of Partap Singh @Channi, Jota Pardhan, Deepu, Narinder Kaur @Nandi, Amna, Pooja, Nandi's nephew, Kala, Babu and a few other persons, forcibly entered her house. According to complainant, at



that point of time they all were armed with baseball bats and sticks, and that the abovementioned group launched an attack upon her husband, thrashed him mercilessly, and inflicted various injuries on his body parts.

3. In her abovementioned statement, it was specifically mentioned by the complainant that Partap Singh @Channi, who was holding baseball bat, Jota, Deepu and Amna, who were holding wooden handles of spade and Narinder Kaur, who was holding sticks had inflicted injuries on various parts of the body of husband of complainant.

4. 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.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent, who has been implicated in the present case only on the basis of vague, inconclusive and omnibus allegations. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents, and that in the FIR although her name has been mentioned, but neither any specific weapon has been alleged to have been carried by the petitioner at the time of occurrence, nor the details of injuries inflicted on the person of her husband has been mentioned. While claiming that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, as out of twenty six prosecution witnesses, not even a single has been examined so far, the learned counsel for the petitioner has urged for the benefit of bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, the



petitioner was a part of an unlawful assembly responsible for the murder of husband of complainant. As per learned State Counsel, being member of the same assembly the petitioner is liable for the offence committed by the abovementioned group.

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 one year and seven months;
- ii) that being female the petitioner deserves a considerate view;
- iii) that allegations in the FIR against the petitioner are not specific. Rather the same are vague and inconclusive;
- iv) that no weapon has been recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- v) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that detention of the 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.

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

25.02.2026

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No