



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

229

CRM-M No.12017 of 2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 11.03.2026

Pardeep Singh @ Nippa

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. J.S.Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.91 dated 07.08.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 333, 109, 118(1), 351(2), 61(2), 191(3) and 190 [Section 118(2) added later on] of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station Bareta, District Mansa.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Ravi Sharma' son of 'Shabeel Dass', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on 06.08.2025 at about 05.30 P.M., 10-12 persons forcibly entered his plot by opening its gate, and that they were armed with



various weapons, the details of identity of the assailants and the weapons used by them were given by the above named complainant as under:-

Accused	weapons
Gurpreet Singh and Kuldeep	Pole-axe (gandasi)
Makhan Chand and Pardeep Singh @ Nippa	Pistol
Parimnder Singh @ Bhinda	Iron rod
Sukhwinder @ Soma and Bittu	Wooden stick
Angrej Singh @ Bittu	Wooden handle of spade
Jugraj Singh @ Jaji	Axe
Sandeep Gujjar	Hammer

The complainant further stated that when he spotted the above named assailants he tried to run away by scaling the wall but ‘Makhan Chand’, with the intention to kill, fired a gun shot which he could not aim properly. As per complainant another assailant ‘Pardeep Singh’ (the petitioner herein) also fired a gun shot but this shot, too, did not hit the complainant. The complainant further alleged that thereafter, he managed to climb over the wall and rushed towards the neighbouring plot, but the assailants followed him surrounded him and inflicted various injuries on his person.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above mentioned statement, formal FIR of this was lodged and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution the complainant was got examined medico-legally, wherein eleven injuries were found on his person.

4. **Notice of motion.**



5. Since advance notice has already been served, Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab, has appeared on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. 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 the record shows that following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision in the present petition:-

- i) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than five months;
- ii) that the allegations against the petitioner are that he had fired a gun shot but no gun-shot injury was suffered by the complainant.
- iii) that the investigation in this case is already complete, and therefore, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- iv) that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital;
- v) that the trial of this case is not likely to be concluded in near



future;

- vi) that the detention of petitioner in the judicial lock-up 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;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not co-operate/participate 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) 3 SCC 22, 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 v. Central Bureau of Investigation’ (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 an undertrial prisoner, as mandated by Hon’ble Apex court in ‘Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and another’ 2024 SCC Online SC 4354.

13. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the aforesaid factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for the concession 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 abovesaid benefit 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 from disclosing 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 trial Court.

15. It is, however, made clear that any observation made hereinabove is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

11.03.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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