

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****223****CRM-M-15238-2026 (O&M)
Decided on : 27.04.2026**

Smt. Krishana alias Krishna

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sunil K.S. Panwar, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Dhruv Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Harmanpreet Kaur, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral)

This petition is the first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita', 2023. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.545 dated 28.08.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 191(3), 115(2), 109(1), 103(1) read with 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonapat, Haryana.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Jagat Singh' hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the abovenamed complainant that there was a dispute with regard to a plot between him and the accused side. According to complainant on 24.08.2025 at about 06:00 P.M., he along with his uncle Sewa Singh and other family



members visited the plot to take photographs. As per complainant, Raj Kumar, Krishana @Krishna (the petitioner), Vikas, Mohit and Chahat along with some unknown persons were already present there. It was alleged by the complainant that they were armed with various weapons, such as lathi (stick), knives and *farsa* (hatchet). The abovenamed complainant further stated that on their arrival the assailants exhorted to teach a lesson and launched an assault upon them and inflicted various injuries on their persons. It was claimed by the complainant that in the abovementioned incident multiple injuries were suffered by them.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. **Notice of motion.**

5. Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG Haryana appears on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. Custody Certificate as well as status report has been filed by learned State Counsel. The same be taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is a 58 years old lady. She has already faced incarceration for a period of almost eight months. According to learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner the role attributed to the petitioner in the alleged incident is minor as the prosecution case shows that she was allegedly carrying a blunt weapon at the time of incident and inflicted injury on the person of Sewa Singh. According to learned Senior Counsel for the

petitioner, any injury on the person of deceased has not been attributed to the petitioner, and that otherwise also, any of the injury attributed to the petitioner has not been declared to be dangerous to life.

8. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments.

9. The learned Senior Counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the present petition and submitted that the petitioner was carrying a wooden stick at the time of incident and injury on the head of Sewa Singh was inflicted by the petitioner, which has been declared to be grievous in nature. It has also been contended by the learned Senior Counsel for the complainant that admittedly, it was a group fight, and that, the presence of the petitioner, on the spot, at the time of occurrence is automatically not established. While contending that one of the injuries inflicted by the petitioner was on the vital part of the body, the learned Senior Counsel for the complainant has argued that in view of gravity of offence also the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. 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 seven months and twenty seven days;
- ii. that the petitioner being a 58 years old lady deserves a considerate view;
- iii. that the injury which has been proved to be fatal, for the deceased, has not been attributed to the petitioner;



- iv. that the injury which is attributed to the petitioner has not been declared dangerous to life;
- v. that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- vi. that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vii. that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- viii. that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- ix. that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- x. that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

12. 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(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, 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”.

13. 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”.

14. 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”.

15. 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.

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

17. 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 abovementioned 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

27.04.2026
Vinod

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No