



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

223

CRM-M No.23536 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.05.2026

Gaurav @ Goldy Yadav**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****..... Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH****Present:** Mr. Parshant Singh Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023'. This petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.396 dated 19.08.2024 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 109(1), 103(1) and 238(a) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Model Town, District Rewari.

2. The facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Mahesh Kumar', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above named complainant that on 18.08.2024 at about 7.00 P.M. on his mobile phone he received a message that a quarrel had taken place with his nephew namely 'Aryan' son of 'Mukhtiar Singh' (the deceased), and that in the above mentioned fighting 'Aryan' had suffered head injury. According to complainant, he was also told that 'Aryan'



was admitted in Pushpanjali Hospital, and therefore, he went to the spot, where friends of 'Aryan' and other relatives were present. According to complainant, 'Aryan' was admitted in critical condition in ICU and when he inquired about the details of incident from the friend of 'Aryan', he came to know that a group comprising of 20-30 boys, carrying various types of weapons, such as steel rods and sharp edged articles had attacked 'Aryan', who along with his friends namely 'Samir', 'Haresh', 'Deepesh', 'Krish' and 'Lakshay' was going on two motorcycle. The complainant further stated that the above mentioned group intercepted the motorcycle of 'Aryan' and launched an attack with the help of their respective weapons and in the above mentioned incident 'Aryan', 'Samir' and 'Haresh' suffered injuries.

3. It is the case of the persecution that in view of above mentioned compliant formal FIR of this case was lodged and investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation on the basis of reliable evidence collected by the Investigating Officer, the petitioner and other accused were arrested.

4. **Notice of motion.**

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana, has appeared on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. She has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However, the learned State counsel has orally opposed the present petition.

6. Heard.



7. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that although the name of the petitioner is recorded in the FIR but no significant role has been attributed to him, and that as per investigating agency a 'danda' (wooden handle) has been recovered from the possession of petitioner. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has clean antecedents, and that he has already suffered incarceration for a period of one year, seven months and two days. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and that co-accused has already been accorded the benefit of bail.

8. Per contra, the learned State counsel has controverted the above mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel the petitioner cannot claim parity with the co-accused, who have been accorded the benefit of bail. According to learned State counsel *firstly*, the name of the petitioner figures in the FIR, and *secondly*, the recovery of weapon of offence has been effected from his possession. As per learned State counsel in view of above, the link between the petitioner and the commission of crime is established. Thus, the learned State counsel has sought for dismissal of present petition.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. 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 already in custody for a period of one year, seven months and two days;
- ii) that the benefit of bail has already been accorded to the



similarly placed co-accused;

- iii) that allegations against the petitioner are that he was member of a large group which was responsible for launching a fatal attack upon the deceased and other injured, but there is no specific attribution of any specific injury to the petitioner;
- iv) that the fatal blow suffered by the deceased is not attributed to the petitioner;
- v) that 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 petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- ix) that there is nothing on record to show that while on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in trial.

11. 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”.

12. 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”.

13. 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”.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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

21.05.2026

Manoj Bhutani

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