



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

Sr.No.248

**CRM-M-12847-2026
Decided on : 27.03.2026**

Jaskaran Singh alias Jass

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Amaninder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Through this application filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, a prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.79 dated 28.09.2024, registered, under Sections 312, 111, 223, 55 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25(6), 25(7), 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 318(4), 311, 336, 338, 336(2), 340, 61 (2) of BNS, 2023 added lateron), at Police Station Bajakhana, District Faridkot,

2. Brief facts, as per the prosecution case, are that the petitioner alongwith co-accused was found in possession of heavy quantity of illegal weapons. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the said FIR. He further contends that the petitioner has no concern with the said offence and false allegations have been levelled against him. Learned counsel contends that there is no allegation against the petitioner that he has committed any offence with the said weapons. Learned counsel contends that no offence



under Section 111 of BNS, 2023 is made out and the offence under Section 312 of BNS, 2023 is also not made out as no attempt was made to rob anyone. He further contends that co-accused Pawandeep Singh, Akashdeep Singh alias Akash alias Akashdeep Singh Chahal and Gurpreet Singh have already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 20.11.2025, passed in CRM-M-16908-2025, CRM-M-4782-2025 and CRM-M-63023-2025. The petitioner is in custody since 28.09.2024. The investigation in the case is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of 23 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He further contends that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that present the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report as well as the custody certificate of the petitioner, which are taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He submits that the petitioner is involved in one more case meaning thereby he is an 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 01 year 05 months and 25 days; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges have also been framed; out of 23 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date; co-accused has already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court and the fact that trial may 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 the 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 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 her 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.

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."

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.

11. The present petition is disposed off accordingly.

27.03.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No