



CRM-M-71679-2025 (O&M)

1

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

126

CRM-M-71679-2025 (O&M)

Decided on : 24.02.2026

Jatinder Kumar @Shenty

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Nand Lal Sammi, Advocate and
Mr. HiteshKumar Sammi, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This petition for bail is first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.213 dated 22.10.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 351(2), 238 and 3(5) of BNS, Police Station Sadar Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Raj Kumar' hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on 20.10.2025 at about 09:30P.M. he along with his son and wife was standing at a shop when Shenty came there and picked-up a quarrel on the pretext of firework by the complainant and his family. According to complainant, after the scuffle they left the spot while extending



CRM-M-71679-2025 (O&M)

2

threat to see the complainant in the morning. According to complainant on 21.10.2025 at about 08:30 A.M. when the complainant was cleaning his shop, Shenty (petitioner herein) along with 2-3 other persons arrived at his shop. As per complainant, they were armed with swords and petitioner exhorted to teach a lesson to him and thereafter, they assaulted him and inflicted injuries on his person.

3. The learned State Counsel has filed short reply as well as custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

4. Heard

5. It has been contended on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of almost four months and that the complainant has already been discharged from the hospital and that the petitioner has clean antecedents.

6. The learned State Counsel being assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, the allegations against the petitioner are for the commission of offence of serious nature, i.e. causing multiple grievous injuries with the help of a sharp-edged weapon. It has been contended by learned counsel for the complainant that similar observations have been made by the learned Additional Sessions Judge Amritsar in his order dated 08.12.2025.

7. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the complainant has also contended that in the present case the statement of the injured and other material witnesses are yet to be recorded and, therefore, the release of



petitioner on bail may provide an opportunity to the petitioner to tamper with the evidence and influence the witnesses.

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 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 of almost four months;
- iii. that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital;
- iv. that nothing has been recovered from the possession of petitioners;
- v. that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents;
- vi. that detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vii. that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- viii. that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner 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 petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.



10. 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(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".

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. 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*. 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 abovementioned 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

24.02.2026

Vinod

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No