



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M No.30260 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.07.2026

Manish @ Manish Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Ayush Tyagi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, AAG, Haryana.

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.152 dated 29.07.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 115, 190, 191(3), 109, 115(2), 117(2), 351(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023, Police Station Sector-17/18, Gurugram.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Rani', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that on 28.07.2025 at about 9.30 P.M. her ten year's daughter namely 'Lakshmi' went to the grocery shop of 'Dev Kumar Singh' and a dispute erupted there, with regard to payment of money, i.e. Rs.50/-. As per complainant, when her daughter returned home and narrated the entire incident, she along with her daughter went to the shop of 'Dev Kumar Singh'



where a quarrel took place and in the abovesaid quarell 'Dev Kumar Singh' was joined by his brother 'Sandeep Kumar', 'Krishna' and 3-4 other persons. The complainant further stated that her other family members namely 'Tinku', 'Ravinder', 'Vikas' and 'Komal' also reached there and a fighting took place between the two groups. According to complainant in the above mentioned incident an injury on the head of 'Tinku' was inflicted by 'Sandeep' with the help of wooden handle, and that injury on the head of 'Ravinder' was inflicted by 'Dev Kumar Singh'.

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. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation the opinion with regard to nature of injury was collected from the Medical Officer, and that the Medical Officer declared the injury suffered by 'Tinku' to be dangerous to life.

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 the petitioner who has clean antecedents has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than nine months, and that all the accused including the accused, to



whom dangerous to life injury has been attributed, i.e. 'Sandeep Kumar' has already been accorded the benefit of bail. It has also been contended that the investigation in this case is already complete, and therefore, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner and the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future.

8. The learned State counsel has controverted the above mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel in the present case the petitioner was a member of group of assailants and formed an unlawful assembly. As per learned State counsel the above said group inflicted injury on the person of 'Tinku', which was declared dangerous to life, and thus the petitioner is liable to face the consequences for the commission of offence punishable under Section 307 of Indian Penal Code.

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 in custody for a period of more than nine months;
- ii) that the co-accused have already been accorded the benefit of bail, including the prime accused, to whom dangerous to life injury suffered by 'Tinku' has been attributed;
- iii) that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- 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 20 prosecution witnesses only 3 have 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.

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

01.07.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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