



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M No.22264 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 03.07.2026

Harinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH**

**Present:** Mr. Ankit Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG Punjab.

**SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):**

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.55 dated 01.06.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 108 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Bhadson, District Patiala.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Manpreet Kaur', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on 21.05.2025 when she was trying to contact her father namely 'Beant Sigh' and brother 'Gurvire Singh' (both deceased), she came to know that both of them committed suicide by hanging. According to complainant subsequently, i.e. on 30.05.2025 during the course of bhog ceremony of her father and brother, the diary and mobile phone of the deceased were found and in the mobile phone there was a video recording and in diary



there was a suicide. As per complainant, it was recorded by her brother 'Gurvinder Singh' that he was being harassed by 'Jatinder Singh @ Bhinda', 'Kuldeep Singh', 'Narinder Singh' along with combine owners namely 'Karamjit Singh' and 'Davinder Singh'.

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

4. The learned State counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. Reply to the petition is already on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent who has been falsely implicated in the present case and that there is no legally admissible evidence against the petitioner. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of five months and ten days, and that the video footage alleged to have been made by the deceased itself shows that the deceased nowhere stated that the petitioner was responsible for the suicide. In addition to above, learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that there is nothing on record to show that there was any kind of abetment of instigation for the commission of suicide by the brother and father of the complainant, and that without any legally admissible evidence, the petitioner is being subjected to suffer incarceration.

7. The learned State counsel has controverted the above mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel the suicide note recorded by



deceased 'Gurvir Singh' has been recovered during the course of investigation and in the suicide note the name of the petitioner and other two co-accused have been specifically mentioned.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. 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 petitioner is in custody for a period of more than five months and ten days;
- ii) that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- iii) that the video footage nowhere does not implicate the petitioner in the commission of offence and even the suicide note does not show that there was any kind of abetment or instigation for the commission of suicide;
- iv) that the investigation in this case is already complete, and therefore, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- v) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as out of 14 prosecution witnesses not even a single witness has been examined so far;
- vi) that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;



- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses;
- viii) 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 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”.

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 an undertrial prisoner, as mandated by Hon'ble Apex court in 'Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and another' 2024 SCC Online SC 4354.

14. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the aforesaid factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled to the concession 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 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.



16. 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

03.07.2026  
*Manoj Bhutani*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |