



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

122

CRM-M-57754-2025

Date of decision: 23.02.2026

KEWAL SINGH

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Madan Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail, which is second petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.24 dated 28.03.2025. The above-mentioned FIR has been filed for the commission of offence punishable under 109(1), 3(5), 223 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, hereinafter being referred to as 'BNS' and Section 25 of Arms Act 1959, Police Station Rureke Kalan, District Barnala.

2. The above-mentioned FIR came into being at the instance of Inspector Baljit Singh, who reported that while leading a team of police officials, he had set up a picket on main Barnala-Mansa road, and that there a car was spotted. As per above-named police officer, a signal was given to the above-mentioned car to stop, but the occupants of the car instead of stopping



the car tried to run away and in the above-mentioned endeavour even fired gunshots upon the police party which hit the official vehicle and the barricade. According to above-named police officer, the occupants of the above-mentioned car including the petitioner were apprehended and from the possession of petitioner as well as his co-accused one weapon each (pistols) were recovered.

3. Heard.

4. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 10 months and 25 days, and that the previous petition was dismissed as withdrawn on 08.07.2025 and the same was not decided on merits. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that vide order dated 08.07.2025, the petitioner was granted liberty to move second petition for bail on completion of six months custody period, and that the above-mentioned period has already expired.

5. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that the petitioner has clean antecedents and instant case is a case of no injury, and that trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as out of 22, not even a single witness has been examined so far.

6. The learned State counsel has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel in the present case, the gravity of offence can be judged from the fact that multiple gunshots were fired at the police party. It has also been contended by learned State counsel that even the firearm recovered from the possession of the petitioner was of restricted bore, and thus, the gravity of the offence increases manifold.

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 more than 10 months and 25 days;
- ii) that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- iii) that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- iv) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as out of 22 witnesses not even a single witness has been examined so far;
- v) that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any useful purpose;
- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not co-operate/participate 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) 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”.

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 abovesaid 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

23.02.2026

vipin

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