



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

212

CRM-M-14899-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision:02.07.2026

CHETAN SINGH

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Kamal Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

CRM-11856-2026

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

1. This petition for bail is the first petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.278 dated 10.05.2023 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 342, 328, 120B & 201 of Indian Penal Code, Police Station Canal City Mandi Dabwali, District Sirsa.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Santosh Kumari', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named



complainant that on 09.05.2023 her son 'Sikendar' had gone to the house of co-accused 'Saroj Rani' and her son 'Bobby', to collect borrowed money, but failed to return. As per complainant on 10.05.2023, she was informed by her niece that 'Sikender' had been tied up, held hostage and brutally assaulted with weapons including a knife and an icebreaker by the co-accused 'Saroj Rani', Bobby and other individuals with intentions to kill him. As per complainant, the above-named persons subsequently shifted the victim to the Government Hospital, Dabwali in an E-Rickshaw and fled. As per complainant, she enquired from the officials of the hospital, who told her that her son 'Sikender' was brought dead.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to above-mentioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. Status report has already been filed by learned State counsel. The same be taken on record. Custody certificate has been filed by learned State counsel. The same, too, be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has already served prolonged incarceration in the present case for a period of more than eight months and seven days, and that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future. It has been further contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the statement of star witness of the prosecution, namely 'Santosh Kumari', has already been recorded as PW-1 in the trial pertaining to co-accused, and that PW-1 has not supported the prosecution case with regard to involvement of petitioner in the commission of above-mentioned offence. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, as per



prosecution story the prime role in the commission of offence has been attributed to two persons namely 'Bobby' and 'Saroj Rani', and that the benefit of bail has already been accorded to both the above-mentioned co-accused.

7. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel the allegations against the petitioner are with regard to commission of serious offence, and that the custody period of the petitioner is not large enough to draw an inference that there is delay in trial.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. 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 eight months and seven days;
- ii) that the investigation, qua the petitioner, is already complete and challan has been filed against him. Thus, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- iii) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as out of twenty two prosecution witnesses only two witnesses have been examined so far;
- iv) that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents;
- v) that the benefit of bail has already been accorded to similarly placed co-accused;
- vi) that the role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of offence is not specific and the statement of star witness, i.e. the alleged eye-witness of the occurrence, does not support the prosecution case with regard to involvement of petitioner in the commission of crime



- vii) that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any useful 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.

10. 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”.

11. 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”.

12. 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”.

13. 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.

14. 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 to the benefit of bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

15. 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 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

02.07.2026
vipin

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