

2026:PHHC:087285



204

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33041-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 11.06.2026

JAGDEEP SINGH

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Amardeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s)

Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. D.S. Dhanoa Dev, Advocate for respondents No. 2 and 3.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. **Relief Sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 439 Cr.P.C. (Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 74 dated 13.06.2025, registered under Sections 109, 117(2), 74, 76, 79, 3(5), 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 307, 325, 354, 354-B, 509, 34 and 120-B IPC), Police Station I.T. City, Mohali, District S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) (P/1), as the matter has been amicably settled between the parties vide compromise dated 02.04.2026 (P/2).

2. **Contentions**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner at the outset submits that the matter has been compromised between the parties as is evident from compromise deed dated 02.04.2026 (P-2). It is further contended that quashing petition bearing No. CRM-M-20594-2026 on the basis of above said compromise has been preferred wherein statements qua compromise have been recorded by the parties, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the other hand, learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record.

Learned State Counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the respondents No. 2 and 3 oppose the prayer for grant of regular bail stating that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in one more FIR.

3. **Analysis**

From the above case it can be culled out the matter has been compromised between the parties as per compromise deed dated dated 02.04.2026 (P-2) and quashing petition bearing No. CRM-M-20594-2026 on the basis of above said compromise has been preferred wherein statement qua compromise have been recorded by the parties, and as per the principle of the criminal jurisprudence, no one should be considered guilty, till the guilt is proved beyond reasonable doubt, and that the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time and detaining the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period.

Reliance can be made upon the judgment of the Apex Court rendered in ***“Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another”, 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal)***

131, wherein it has been held that the grant of bail is a general rule and putting persons in jail or in prison or in correction home is an exception. Relevant paras of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

“2. 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.

3. 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.

4. While so introspecting, among the factors that need to be considered is whether the accused was arrested during investigations when that person perhaps has the best opportunity to tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. If the investigating officer does not find it necessary to arrest an accused person during investigations, a strong case should be made out for placing that person in judicial custody after a charge sheet is filed. Similarly, it is important to ascertain whether the accused was participating in the investigations to the satisfaction of the investigating officer and was not absconding or not appearing when required by the investigating officer. Surely, if an accused is not hiding from the investigating officer or is hiding due to some genuine and expressed fear of being victimised, it would be a factor that a judge would need to consider in an appropriate case. It is also necessary for the judge to consider whether the accused is a first-time offender or has been

accused of other offences and if so, the nature of such offences and his or her general conduct. The poverty or the deemed indigent status of an accused is also an extremely important factor and even Parliament has taken notice of it by incorporating an Explanation to section 436 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. An equally soft approach to incarceration has been taken by Parliament by inserting section 436A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

*5. To put it shortly, a humane attitude is required to be adopted by a judge, while dealing with an application for remanding a suspect or an accused person to police custody or judicial custody. There are several reasons for this including maintaining the dignity of an accused person, howsoever poor that person might be, the requirements of Article 21 of the Constitution and the fact that there is enormous overcrowding in prisons, leading to social and other problems as noticed by this Court in *In Re-Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons*, 2017(4) RCR (Criminal) 416: 2017(5) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 408 : (2017) 10 SCC 658*

*6. The historical background of the provision for bail has been elaborately and lucidly explained in a recent decision delivered in *Nikesh Tara chand Shah v. Union of India*, 2017 (13) SCALE 609 going back to the days of the Magna Carta. In that decision, reference was made to *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565 in which it is observed that it was held way back in *Nagendra v. King-Emperor*, AIR 1924 Calcutta 476 that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. Reference was also made to *Emperor v. Hutchinson*, AIR 1931 Allahabad 356 wherein it was observed that grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception. The provision for bail is therefore age-old and the liberal interpretation to the provision for bail is almost a century old, going back to colonial days.*

7. However, we should not be understood to mean that bail should be granted in every case. The grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously and in a humane manner and compassionately. Also, conditions for the grant of bail ought not to be so strict as to be incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.”

As regards the objection raised by the State regarding the petitioner's involvement in another case under the Arms Act is concerned, reliance can be placed

upon the order of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as “**Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab**” decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial of concession of bail.

4. Decision:

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

In the afore-said terms, the present petition is hereby allowed.

However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

11.06.2026
anuradha

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