



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

131

CRM-M-72671-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 19.02.2026

Jatinder Singh @Jindi

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Dhiraj Jindal, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

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.180 dated 11.10.2025 for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 109, 115(2), 117(2), 126(2), 298, 191(3), and 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Moti Nagar, District Ludhiana.

2. The abovementioned FIR came into being on the statement of 'Tanvir Singh', who had stated that he was a school bus driver, and that on 05.10.2025 he was driving the bus bearing registration No.PB10-FV-9114 followed by another bus being driven by his brother. As per complainant, at about 08:25 pm, when they were near DCM School, they found a jeep bearing registration No.PB11-J-0936 moving ahead of them. As per



complainant to seek side he honked, but the driver and 6-7 occupants of the jeep got annoyed due to honking, and they started hurling/abuses to him, and forced him to stop the bus by blocking its way and thereafter, dragged him out of the bus, and inflicted multiple injuries on his person..

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged against the accused Bhalla, Sahil Rana, Binder Gill, Jatinder Singh @Jindi (petitioner) and 10-12 unknown persons and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution, during the course of investigation petitioner suffered a disclosure statement, wherein he disclosed that at the time of occurrence, Ankush Saini was also present and accordingly, he was nominated as an accused in the present case.

4. **Notice of motion.**

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Hence service of notice is hereby dispensed with. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. Reply has already been placed on record.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner, and that present case is a case of simple road-rage, wherein there are allegations and counter-allegations against both the parties. It has also been contended by learned counsel for



the petitioner that there is delay of more than six days in reporting the matter to the police, and this fact is fatal for the prosecution case.

8. The learned State Counsel, being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has controverted the abovementioned arguments. It has been contended by learned counsel for the complainant that in the present case, the total custody period of the petitioner is very short, and that even the statement of complainant/injured has not been recorded by the learned trial court. According to learned counsel for the complainant, at this stage no ground for release of petitioner on bail is made out.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. 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 four months;
- ii) that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital;
- iii) that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents;
- iv) that co-accused has already been accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail;
- v) that there is a delay of six days in reporting the matter to the police;
- vi) that investigation in this case is already complete and nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- vii) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;



- viii) that detention of the petitioner in judicial lockup is not likely to serve any purpose;
- ix) 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
- x) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

11. 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 also 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”.

12. 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”.

13. 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”.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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

19.02.2026

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No