



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

237

CRM-M No.32425 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 03.07.2026

Mani Randhawa @ Manmeet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Aditya Anand, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Fateh Sahota, Advocate for the complainant.

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.56 dated 14.03.2026, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 109, 115(2), 61(2), 351(2), 191(3) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Chheharata, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Surjit Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on 13.03.2026 at about 09:00 A.M. he had witnessed an incident wherein 'Mani Randhawa' (the petitioner herein), along with co-accused 'Bamb', assaulted 'Vishal Singh' following a dispute arising out of a motorcycle collision. It was further alleged that on the same day at about



04:30 P.M. co-accused 'Karanjit Singh @ Dhanni', on the pretext of effecting a compromise, took the complainant and 'Vishal Singh' to a water tank, where 'Mani Randhawa' along with co-accused Rahul, armed with a datar, Gagan (armed with a baseball bat) and 5-6 unknown persons, was already present. There all the accused launched a concerted assault upon the complainant and 'Vishal Singh' with their respective weapons. It was further alleged that co-accused 'Gagan' inflicted 3-4 baseball bat blows on the person of complainant, which hit his leg, whereas another unknown assailant inflicted injury on his head with the help of a datar. The complainant further stated that petitioner, along other co-accused inflicted repeated datar blows on the person of 'Vishal Singh', while one unknown assailant inflicted a datar blow on the head of 'Vishal Singh's'. According to complainant, as a result of abovesaid attack he was drenched in blood and fell down on the ground.

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. **Notice of motion.**

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab, 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 by learned counsel for the petitioner that in



the present case the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of more than two months and twenty one days, and that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the weapon of offence has already been recovered, and that the investigation is already complete, and therefore, nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner.

8. In addition to above, it has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that otherwise also the parties belong to the same village and with the intervention of the respectables of the society they have entered into compromise, which has already been reduced into writing in the form of a Compromise Deed dated 24.03.2026. According to learned counsel for the petitioner since the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of bail.

9. The learned State counsel has controverted the above mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel in the present case there are two injured, and that injury suffered by one of the victim namely 'Vishal' was, too, serious that he had to be placed on ventilator. According to learned State counsel the offence is non-compoundable, and therefore, any compromise between the parties is not going to affect the outcome of present prosecution. According to learned State counsel in view of gravity of offence the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of bail.

10. The learned counsel for the complainant has not opposed the bail petition and supported the stand of learned counsel for the petitioner, qua the fact that parties have reached to a compromise.



11. The record has been perused carefully.

12. 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 two months and twenty one days;
- ii) that the petitioner has no criminal history with regard to assault case (although one case under NDPS Act is pending against him);
- iii) that admittedly, both the injured have already been discharged from the hospital;
- 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;
- 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.

13. 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”.

14. 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”.

15. 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”.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. 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