



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

201

CRM-M-22451-2026

Date of decision: 05.06.2026

KARANVIR SINGH ALIAS KARANBIR SINGH ALIAS KARAN

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Ankit Kharbanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Thind, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

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.0229 dated 29.11.2025 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 109, 191(3) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Kamboj, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Dilbagh Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that on 28.11.2025, at about 08:15 PM, he was parking his car,



wherein 'Dilpreet Singh' alongwith 'David Masih', 'Samuel Masih' came there. According to complainant 'David Masih' was armed with a pistol and he hit the mirror of the car with the butt of above-mentioned pistol. The complainant further stated that thereafter 'Samuel Masih' made a call to somebody else and on his call 8-10 persons armed including 'Gaja', 'Raju', 'Karan' (the petitioner herein), 'Deepu', 'Gora', 'Jasbir Singh', 'Raja' and 'Karam' arrived on the spot. As per complainant they launched an assault upon him and 'David Masih' fired a gunshot with the intention to kill him. As per complainant, the gunshot injured his left shoulder.

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. Short Reply and custody certificate have been filed by learned State counsel. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than six months, and that he has clean antecedents. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that any specific role to the petitioner has not been attributed in the FIR, and that the gunshot injury has been attributed to co-accused 'David Masih' only. According to learned counsel for the petitioner since trial is not likely to be concluded in future, the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of bail.

7. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel in the present case there are very specific allegations against the petitioner and his co-accused that they had



formed an unlawful assembly and pursuant to common object of abovesaid unlawful assembly, they inflicted gunshot injury on the person of complainant, attracting Section 307 IPC. As per learned State counsel in view of gravity of offence, the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of bail.

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 has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than six months;
- ii) that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- iii) that the investigation in this case qua the petitioner is already complete, and therefore, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- iv) that the role attributed to the petitioner is that he was present on the spot at the time of incident, however, neither any weapon has been assigned to the petitioner nor any injury, suffered by the complainant, has been attributed to the petitioner;
- v) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any useful 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 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

05.06.2026

vipin

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