



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

235

CRM-M No.14297 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.03.2026

Jagdish Singh @ Jagdish @ JK

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Aditya Anand, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Fateh Sahota, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is the second 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.3 dated 08.04.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4) 319(2), 316(5) and 111 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66(d) of Information Technology Act, Police Station Cyber Crime, District Rupnagar.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Lokesh Goyal', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that he had received a message on his WhatsApp No.85289-99222, from an unknown person, who asked him to download the Telegram application. According to complainant, when he downloaded the Telegram application, he received a message from an ID



which was in the name of 'Deepak Chopra'. As per complainant he started chatting with 'Deepak Chopra', and thereafter, on receipt of a message through Telegram application, he joined a group.

3. It is the claim of the complainant that he was prompted to invest money for speedy growth, and that being influenced by the claims made by the abovesaid persons, through abovementioned Telegram application he invested a sum of Rs.30,65,000/- by transferring money through various modes on different occasions.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of abovementioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution during the course of investigation, the petitioner has been arrested.

5. **Notice of motion.**

6. 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.

7. Mr. Fateh Sahota, Advocate puts in appearance on behalf of respondent and files Power of Attorney. The same be taken on record.

8. Heard.

9. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is an innocent and illiterate person, whose documents pertaining to



his bank account, i.e. passbook, cheque book and ATM card etc., have been misused by other co-accused, who is an official of the bank. As per learned counsel for the petitioner the parties have already entered into compromise.

10. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of almost seven months, and that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has clean antecedents.

11. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned. According to learned State Counsel, the allegations against the petitioner are of serious nature, and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

12. The learned counsel for the complainant has not opposed the petition. It has been conceded by him that the parties have settled their dispute amicably.

13. The record has been perused carefully.

14. 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 offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of almost seven months;



- iii) that the custody certificate shows that petitioner has clean antecedents.
- iv) that the only allegation against the petitioner is that his account was used for siphoning-off the money;
- v) that the investigation in this case is already complete, and therefore, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- vi) that the trial of this case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vii) that the detention of petitioner in the 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;
- ix) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not co-operate/participate in the trial.

15. 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”.

16. 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”.

17. 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”.

18. 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.

19. 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.



20. 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.

21. 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

19.03.2026

Manoj Bhutani

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