



CRM-M-60675-2025

1

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

247

CRM-M-60675-2025

Date of decision 15.01.2026

JAGROOP SINGH ALIAS LALLI

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Ms. Dolly Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 25, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, 1959, Section 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, hereinafter being referred to as 'BNS' only [Section 27-A of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 hereinafter being referred to as 'NDPS' added later on], the FIR No.120 dated 01.06.2025, has been lodged in Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar Rural. With regard to commission of above mentioned offence, the petitioner has been arrested. He is in custody, and therefore, craving for the concession of bail. This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of ASI Tarsem Singh. It was reported



by the above-named ASI that on 01.06.2025, when he was heading a police party deputed for patrolling duty, he received a tip-off that Fateh Singh @ Gadhi, Ranjit Singh @ Kaka and Jagroop Singh @ Lalli were involved in the sale of illegal weapons smuggled from Pakistan. As per above-named police officer the informant told him that the above-said persons were waiting for a party for delivery of consignment at a bridge on village Brar-Kuhala road.

3. As per prosecution in view of above-mentioned information, when the raid was conducted, eight unlicensed weapons and cartridges were recovered.

4. No reply in writing has been filed by learned State counsel. However, the learned State counsel has opted to orally oppose the instant petition.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already served imprisonment for a period of more than 07 months, and that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and that the benefit of bail has already been afforded to the co-accused of the petitioner. On the above-mentioned grounds, the benefit of bail has been sought for the petitioner.

7. *Per contra*, the learned State counsel has argued that allegations against the petitioner are for the commission of serious offence, and that the petitioner does not have clean antecedents, as earlier also he has been prosecuted for the commission of offence punishable under Section 380 IPC.



As per learned State counsel if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to indulge in similar kind of criminal activities and therefore, he is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration, for the decision of present petition: -

- i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 07 months;
- iii) that the benefit of bail has already been afforded to similarly placed co-accused;
- iv) that nothing is 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 useful 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;

10. 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) 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”.

11. 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”.

12. 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”.

13. Therefore, 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.

14. 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.

15. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby **allowed**, and subject to the conditions



mentioned below, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court, subject to the 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

15.01.2026
vipin

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