



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

Sr.No.255

**CRM-M-10805-2026
Decided on : 25.03.2026**

Parshant Kumar alias Parshant Kumar Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Naveen Kundu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Armaan Dahiya, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Tejas Bansal, Advocate for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.480 dated 06.11.2023, registered under Sections 323, 324 and 506 IPC (Sections 307 and 326 IPC added lateron), at Police Station Tehsil Camp, Panipat.

2. Brief facts, as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner attacked Sonam Rani (daughter of complainant) with an intention to kill her. Hence the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and falsely implicated in the present FIR. He further contends that the petitioner has no concern with the said offence. He submits that the present dispute arose out of matrimonial discard between the petitioner and his wife and now the matter has been compromised between the parties and the compromise/settlement agreement dated 04.12.2025 affirming the



factum of compromise has been annexed as Annexure P-4. Learned counsel further contends that the parties have also filed a petition for quashing of present FIR on the basis of compromise which is pending before a Coordinate Bench of this Court for 18.05.2026, the petitioner is in custody since 11.11.2023 and nothing is to be recovered from him. Thus, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars. Therefore, learned counsel prays that the present petition be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the petition for grant of regular bail to the petitioner by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He further submits that the petitioner is also involved in one more case meaning thereby he is a habitual offender. However, he could not controvert the fact that the parties have filed a petition for quashing of present FIR.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has appeared today in court and filed his memo of appearance, which is taken on record. He does not dispute the factum of compromise and submits that he has no objection if the present petition is allowed.

6. 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 02 years 04 months and 13 days; the matter has been compromised between the parties and a petition seeking quashing of present FIR has already been filed. Thus, further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. His further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under

Article 21 of the Constitution of India.



7. 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 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".

8. 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.

9. 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***

10. 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."

11. Without commenting on the merits of the case and keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

12. All other pending applications, if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

25.03.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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