



CRM-M-20240-2026 (O&M)

1

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

259

CRM-M-20240-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision : 21.04.2026

Phool Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate and
Mr. Salender Sarout, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Satbir Singh Goripuria, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Ajay Chauhan, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This petition for bail is the first petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.244 dated 16.09.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 109(1), 190, 191(3), 115(2), 117(2), 118(1), 351(3), 238 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Mundkati, District Palwal.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Umrao', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that his house as well as the house of accused are situated in the same street, and that on 14.09.2025, the complainant had parked his pick-up vehicle in front of his house, in the

**CRM-M-20240-2026 (O&M)**

2

street. As per complainant, at about 10:30 pm, the accused 'Satpal' came there in a drunken state and started hurling abuses at the complainant. According to complainant, when he objected to the abovementioned conduct of the accused 'Satpal', the accused 'Satpal' threatened to teach him a lesson and then called the other assailants, namely 'Phool Singh' (the petitioner herein), Rajdeep, Lakhan and others, who were armed with *lathi* (bamboo stick), a *farsa* (a sharp-edged weapon) and an axe.

3. The complainant has further alleged that the abovementioned assailants launched an assault upon him and inflicted injuries on his person, the details of which were also given by the above-named complainant. It was also alleged by the complainant that his other family members, too, came under attack and suffered injuries.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned statement, formal FIR in this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution, during the course of investigation the petitioner was arrested on 26.10.2025.

5. **Notice of motion.**

6. Mr. Satbir Singh Goripuria, DAG Haryana appears on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. No custody certificate of the petitioner and formal reply have been filed by the State. However, the learned State Counsel has orally opposed the present petition.

**CRM-M-20240-2026 (O&M)**

3

7. Memorandum of Appearance on behalf of the complainant has been filed. The same be taken on record.

8. Heard.

9. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that he has clean antecedents. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further contended that two co-accused have already been accorded the benefit of anticipatory bail and two have been released on regular bail.

10. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, although two injuries suffered by 'Umrao' have been declared to be dangerous to life, but the same have not been attributed to the petitioner, who was allegedly carrying bamboo stick at the time of alleged assault. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than five months, and that investigation in this case is already complete, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner.

11. The learned State Counsel, being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned counsel for the complainant, in the present case two injuries suffered by 'Umrao' have been declared to be dangerous to life by the Medical Officer, and that all the assailants, under common conspiracy, had launched an attack upon the complainant as well as his family, and therefore, in view of gravity of offence, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

**CRM-M-20240-2026 (O&M)**

4

12. The record has been perused carefully.

13. 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 five months and twenty five days;
- ii) that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents;
- iii) that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital;
- iv) that the injury which has been declared dangerous to life, has not been attributed to the petitioner;
- 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 is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vii) that the detention of the petitioner in judicial lockup 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; and
- ix) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

14. 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 also 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”.

15. 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”.

16. 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”.

17. 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.

**CRM-M-20240-2026 (O&M)**

7

18. 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.

19. 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

21.04.2026*Gaurav Thakur*

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No