



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

214

**CRM-M-58840-2025 (O&M)  
Decided on : 18.02.2026**

Amandeep Kumar &amp; Anr.

..... Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH**

Present: Mr. Shubham Budania, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asst. A.G. Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.**

This petition for bail, which is the first petition filed by the petitioners under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.72 dated 09.03.2025 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 351(2), 3(5), 333, 118(1), 118(2), 127(2), 331(7), 331(8) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station City Mandi Dabwali, District Sirsa.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being on the statement of 'Tarsem Lal', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on 09.03.2025 at about 10:30 pm, when he was present in his home at ground floor, his daughter-in-law, namely Mannat, who was on the terrace, called him by saying that 4-5 boys, present behind their home, were hurling abuses for them. According to complainant, when he rushed to the terrace, he saw that four boys by scaling the main



gate, had entered into the house, and came on terrace. As per complainant, name of one of the abovementioned boys was Tushar, R/o Nar Singh Colony Doomwali, Punjab, who was armed with sword, and his three accomplices were armed with iron rod, baseball bat, and kappa [folklore, a sharp-edged weapon], respectively.

3. It was further alleged by the complainant that all the abovementioned assailants inflicted injuries on the person of Mannat, and then bolted her in the room, snatched her necklace (*mangalsutra*), and thereafter, launched an attack upon the complainant and inflicted injuries on his person.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned statement, the formal FIR of this case was lodged, the investigation taken up, and the accused were arrested.

5. **Notice of motion.**

6. Ms. Deepali Verma, Asst. A.G. Haryana appears on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioners. 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. 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 offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii. that the petitioners No.1 and 2 are already in custody for a period of approximately eight months and nine months, respectively;
- iii. that benefit of bail has already been accorded to co-accused;
- iv. that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital;
- v. that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioners;
- vi. that investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vii. that detention of the petitioners in judicial lockup is not likely to serve any purpose;
- viii. that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioners may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- ix. that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioners will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

9. In the present case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court 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 petitioners are 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 petitioners are 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 petitioners 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 petitioners 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 petitioners shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial Court.

**(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**18.02.2026**

*Gaurav Thakur*

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether Reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No