



CRM-M-68091-2025 1

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

129

CRM-M-68091-2025

Date of decision: 25.02.2026

UMESH

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Tushar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG, Haryana

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail, which is the first petition, has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.275 dated 20.08.2025. The above-mentioned FIR has been filed for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 25(6), 29-54-59 of Arms Act, Police Station City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. The above-mentioned FIR came into being at the instance of ASI Parvesh, who had reported that on 20.08.2025 at about 07:20 PM, when he was leading a team of police officials a reliable source gave him a tip-off that that Amit Kumar @ Meeta @ Commando was present in Sector-10 market, and that he was carrying illegal weapons. According to above-named police officer in view of above-mentioned information, the police party went to the parking of Sector-10 Market and apprehended a person matching with the description



of Amit Kumar. As per report, on search of his person two pistols and cartridges were recovered.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to above-mentioned recovery, requisite formalities with regard to seizure and sealing of illegal weapons and cartridges, filing of FIR and formal arrest of the accused were undertaken. As per prosecution, thereafter, the accused was interrogated, who suffered a disclosure statement, wherein he nominated the petitioner as the supplier of above-mentioned pistols.

4. Heard.

5. The record has been perused carefully.

6. 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 petitioner is already in custody for a period more than 06 months;
- iii) that the maximum punishment prescribed for the commission of offence is imprisonment up to three years;
- iv) that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- v) that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any useful purpose;
- vi) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- 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.

7. 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".

8. 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”.

9. 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”.

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 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.

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 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

25.02.2026

vipin

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