



CRM-M-44127-2025 (O&M)

1

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

129

CRM-M-44127-2025 (O&M)

Decided on : 24.02.2026

Shivam Yadav

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Balraj Gujjar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This petition for bail is first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.24 dated 20.01.2025 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station Adrash Nagar, District Faridabad.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Dinesh' hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that he was working as a security guard and on 19.01.2025 at about 10:40 P.M. when he was on duty his daughter called him and informed that two persons had told her that son of complainant namely 'Chetan' was lying in a outhouse. As per complainant thereafter, another caller told him that 'Chetan' had suffered injuries and was admitted in the hospital. According to complainant on receipt of the abovementioned information he



CRM-M-44127-2025 (O&M)

2

went to hospital and there he came to know that his son had passed away. It was further stated by the complainant that he was having a doubt that Shivam (petitioner herein), Sagar and Aniket @Vivek had caused injuries on his person.

3. Custody Certificate has been filed by learned State Counsel. The same be taken on record.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of one year & one month only, and that the status report submitted by the respondent-State shows that the role attributed to the petitioner is that he was present on the spot at the time of occurrence and inflicted injuries with the help of slaps and punches. According to learned counsel for the petitioner as per medico-legal report multiple injuries were suffered by the deceased and all those injuries were caused with the help of sharp-edged weapon. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has clean antecedents, and that no weapon of offence has been attributed, or recovered, from him.

6. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel the petitioner was part of a group of assailants which had inflicted multiple injuries on the person of deceased and therefore, by virtue of Section 3(5) of BNS, the petitioner is responsible for the act of the abovementioned group of assailants.



CRM-M-44127-2025 (O&M)

3

7. The record has been perused carefully.
8. 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 is already in custody for a period of one year & one month only;
 - ii. that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
 - iii. that no weapon of offence has been attributed to the petitioner;
 - iv. that no weapon of offence has been recovered from the possession of petitioner;
 - v. that detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
 - vi. that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as out of twenty five prosecution witnesses not even a single witness has been examined;
 - 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; and
 - viii. that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.
9. 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(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, 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”.

10. 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”.

11. 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”.

12. 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.

13. 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 for the benefit of bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

14. 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 abovementioned 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

24.02.2026

Vinod

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No