



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

CRM-M-38711-2025

Date of Decision:25.07.2025

ANIL @ NANHA

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Yaseen Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Ms. Chhavi Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (Oral)**

1. **Relief sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 439 dated 16.07.2015 under Sections 148, 149, 307 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act of the IPC registered at Police Station-Sonipat City, District-Sonipat, Haryana.

2. **Contentions**

**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case as he is not named in the FIR and it is only after one month and two days the complainant recorded his supplementary statement before the police officials and named the petitioner and alleged that the vehicle involved in the incident was arranged by the petitioner. He further submits that other co-accused namely Sachin Sharma, Ravi, Ajit @ Foji, Ajay Chandgi and Ram Karan have already been granted the concession of bail vide orders dated 28.03.2018 passed in CRM-M-2522



-2018, dated 28.07.2017 passed in CRM-M-20592 of 2017, dated 18.10.2016 passed in CRM-M-30987 of 2016, dated 28.03.2017 passed in CRM-M-4319 of 2017 and dated 08.04.2016 passed in CRM-M-38427 of 2015. Counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that the petitioner is in judicial custody since 06 years, 10 months and 17 days and conclusion of the trial is likely to take some time. It is further submitted that since the material witnesses including the injured witnesses have failed to support the prosecution version, he may be granted the concession of regular bail.

**On behalf of the State**

On the other hand, learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner today in Court, which is taken on record. He seeks dismissal of the instant petition on the ground that it was only the petitioner who arranged the car and struck the vehicle of the complainant, therefore, he is directly involved in the incident.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the custody period i.e. 06 years 08 months and 17 days for which the petitioner has suffered incarceration; the petitioner was nominated as an accused only on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant, which is recorded only after one month and two days, in addition to the fact co-accused have already been granted bail by this Court coupled with the fact that investigation is complete, challan stands presented to Court on 03.11.2018, charges have been framed on 12.02.2019 and out of total 52 prosecution witnesses cited only 33 have been examined till date, which is suffice for this Court to infer



that the conclusion of trial will take long time for which the petitioner cannot be detained behind the bars for an indefinite period.

Reliance can be placed upon the judgment of the Apex Court rendered in “***Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another***”, 2018(2) ***R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein it has been held that the grant of bail is a general rule and putting persons in jail or in prison or in correction home is an exception. Relevant paras of the said judgment is reproduced as under:-

*“2. 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.*

*3. 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.*

*4. While so introspecting, among the factors that need to be considered is whether the accused was arrested during investigations when that person perhaps has the best opportunity to tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses. If the investigating officer does not find it necessary to arrest an accused person during investigations, a strong case should be made out for*



*placing that person in judicial custody after a charge sheet is filed. Similarly, it is important to ascertain whether the accused was participating in the investigations to the satisfaction of the investigating officer and was not absconding or not appearing when required by the investigating officer. Surely, if an accused is not hiding from the investigating officer or is hiding due to some genuine and expressed fear of being victimised, it would be a factor that a judge would need to consider in an appropriate case. It is also necessary for the judge to consider whether the accused is a first-time offender or has been accused of other offences and if so, the nature of such offences and his or her general conduct. The poverty or the deemed indigent status of an accused is also an extremely important factor and even Parliament has taken notice of it by incorporating an Explanation to section 436 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. An equally soft approach to incarceration has been taken by Parliament by inserting section 436A in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.*

*5. To put it shortly, a humane attitude is required to be adopted by a judge, while dealing with an application for remanding a suspect or an accused person to police custody or judicial custody. There are several reasons for this including maintaining the dignity of an accused person, howsoever poor that person might be, the requirements of Article 21 of the Constitution and the fact that there is enormous overcrowding in prisons, leading to social and other problems as noticed by this Court in *In Re-Inhuman Conditions in 1382 Prisons*, 2017(4) RCR (Criminal) 416: 2017(5) Recent Apex Judgments (R.A.J.) 408 : (2017) 10 SCC 658*

*6. The historical background of the provision for bail has been elaborately and lucidly explained in a recent decision delivered in *Nikesh Tara chand Shah v. Union of India*, 2017 (13) SCALE 609 going back to the days of the Magna Carta. In that decision, reference was made to *Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia v. State of Punjab*, (1980) 2 SCC 565 in which it is observed that it was held way back in *Nagendra v. King-Emperor*, AIR 1924 Calcutta 476 that bail is not to be withheld as a punishment. Reference was also made to *Emperor v. Hutchinson*, AIR 1931 Allahabad 356 wherein it was observed that grant of bail is the rule and refusal is the exception. The provision for bail is therefore age-old and the liberal*



*interpretation to the provision for bail is almost a century old, going back to colonial days.*

*7. However, we should not be understood to mean that bail should be granted in every case. The grant or refusal of bail is entirely within the discretion of the judge hearing the matter and though that discretion is unfettered, it must be exercised judiciously and in a humane manner and compassionately. Also, conditions for the grant of bail ought not to be so strict as to be incapable of compliance, thereby making the grant of bail illusory.”*

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 is the mandate of the Apex court in *Balwinder Singh versus State of Punjab and another*”, SLO (Crl.) No. 8523/2024. Relevant paras of the said judgment reads as under:-

*“7. An accused has a right to a fair trial and while a hurried trial is frowned upon as it may not give sufficient time to prepare for the defence, an inordinate delay in conclusion of the trial would infringe the right of an accused guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution.*

*8. It is not for nothing the Author Oscar Wilde in “The Ballad of Reading Gaol”, wrote the following poignant lines while being incarcerated:*

*“I know not whether Laws be right,  
Or whether Laws be wrong;  
All that we know who be in jail  
Is that the wall is strong;  
And that each day is like a year,  
A year whose days are long.”*

4. As far as the pendency of other cases and involvement of the petitioner in other cases is concerned, reliance can be placed upon the order



of this Court rendered in CRM-M-25914-2022 titled as “*Baljinder Singh alias Rock vs. State of Punjab*” decided on 02.03.2023, wherein, while referring Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court has held that no doubt, at the time of granting bail, the criminal antecedents of the petitioner are to be looked into but at the same time it is equally true that the appreciation of evidence during the course of trial has to be looked into with reference to the evidence in that case alone and not with respect to the evidence in the other pending cases. In such eventuality, strict adherence to the rule of denial of bail on account of pendency of other cases/convictions in all probability would land the petitioner in a situation of denial of concession of bail.

5. **DECISION:**

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

In the afore-said terms, the present petition is hereby allowed.

However, it is made clear that anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)  
JUDGE

25.07.2025

kv

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