

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh**Criminal Misc. No. M-61479 of 2025****Date of Decision: 23.02.2026**

Pankaj Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Anupal Singh Tanwar, Advocate
for Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for bail, which is first 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. 12 dated 07.01.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 103(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 [Section 3(5) deleted and Sections 190 and 191(3) were added later on] Police Station Mujesar, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Satyanarayan' hereinafter being referred to as "complainant" only. It was stated by the complainant that on 06.01.2025 at about 07.00 P.M. his son 'Ayush' had left home with his friends 'Golu' and 'Umesh', and that after sometime when he called his son on his mobile phone, the call was

a fight, and that he was admitted in B.K.Hospital. According to complainant when he reached the hospital, he came to know that his son was declared dead. The complainant further stated that he came to know that Umesh's brother 'Varun' who was working at 'Victor Enterprises' had some altercation with a boy, and that to sort out the matter when his son 'Ayush', 'Umesh' and 'Golu' went to meet the opposite party a fight broke-out between them, i.e. 'Ayush' etc. on one side and 'Ashish', 'Atul', 'Jila', 'Pankaj' and other associates on other side. According to complainant, in the above mentioned fight 'Ayush' had suffered injuries which proved to be fatal.

3. It is the case of prosecution that in view of above mentioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution, during the course of investigation it was revealed that the injury responsible for the death of 'Ayush' was caused by a sharp-pointed weapon, i.e. 'Poker' which was used by the accused 'Jilajit'. During the course of investigation it was developed that the petitioner was carrying a stick and caused injuries on the person of deceased with the help of that stick only.

4. Heard.

5. The record has been perused carefully.

6. A careful perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are necessary to be taken into consideration for a decision:-

- i) that the petitioner is in custody for a period of more than one year, one month & 14 days;

- ii) that the petitioner has clean antecedents;
- iii) that the weapon of offence has already been recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- iv) that the injury which proved to be fatal has not been attributed to the petitioner;
- v) that trial of the case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- vii) that further detention of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- ix) that there is nothing on record to show that while on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

7. With regard to the legal aspect involved in the instant case, it is relevant to mention that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Dataram v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another' (2018) 3 Supreme Court Cases 22, has 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.”

8. The principles laid down by the Hon’ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of ‘Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation’ (2022) 10 Supreme Court Cases 51, are also relevant in this case. In the above mentioned 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.”

9. Recently, in the case of ‘Tapas Kumar Palit v. State of Chhattisgarh’, 2025 SCC Online SC 322 the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India 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 above mentioned 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.”

10. 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.

11. If the cumulative effect of all the above mentioned 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.

12. 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 above said concession shall be subject to following conditions:-

- a) 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;
- b) 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 conclusion of trial; and
- c) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial Court.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

February 23, 2026
“DK”

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