



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-26933-2025
DECIDED ON: 21.05.2025

BALWINDER SINGH ALIAS BINDU ALIAS BINDER SINGH
.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Vidit Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Verma, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. **Relief sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 483 of BNSS seeking the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.50 dated 23.03.2023, under Sections 302, 120-B and 34 IPC registered at Police Station Dharamkot, Moga.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“Statement of Kashmir Singh son of Balkar Singh son of Nihal Singh resident of Sherpur Taiba aged about 50 years, mob. No. 9463780188, it is stated that I am resident of above mentioned address and working as labourer. I have two daughters and two sons. My elder daughter namely Amarjit Kaur Babbu aged about 25 years performed love marriage with Balwinder Singh @ Bindu son of Mangat Singh of our village 6 years ago. They were blessed with 2 children. Balwinder Singh Bindu is habitual of selling intoxicants and he had illicit relations with other women.

My daughter used to forbade him for the same. Due to which there used to be quarrel'Contents: Copy of statement, statement of Kashmir Singh son of Balkar Singh son of Nihal Singh resident of Sherpur Taiba aged about 50 years, mob. No. 9463780188, it is stated that I am resident of above mentioned address and working as labourer. I have two daughters and two sons. My elder daughter namely Amarjit Kaur Babbu aged about 25 years performed love marriage with Balwinder Singh @ Bindu son of Mangat Singh of our village 6 years ago. They were blessed Balwinder Singh Bindu is with habitual 2 of children. selling intoxicants and he had illicit relations with other women. My daughter used to forbade him for the same. Due to which there used to be quarrel among them. Two days ago Balwinder Singh had also withdrawn Rs. 80,000/- from the bank a/c of my daughter. My daughter informed me about the same. Yesterday at about 10 in the night Balwinder Singh called me that "at about 9:30 I along with my wife Amarjit Kaur Babbu was coming towards our village Sherpur Taiba from village Dholewala on my motorcycle. When we reached at bridge of canal in the revenue limits of village Sherpur Taiba then 6 persons riding on 3 motorcycles encircled us and gave injuries to my wife. All the persons ran away from the spot and I also ran away from the spot. When I along with my brother Jagir Singh were about to leaving for the spot then we came to know that my daughter has been murdered and Balwinder Singh etc has brought the dead body at home and Balwinder Singh etc. has called the police officials and kept the dead body at the Mortuary House of CH/Moga. Thereafter we reached at Civil Hospital Moga and had seen the dead body of our daughter and there was cut mark on her right shoulder and there were other injuries. It seems that she was strangulated also. We are sure that said Singh Bindu, Jyoti, Sukhwinder Singh, Gurpreet Singh Gopi son of Mehar Singh resident of Daulewala Mayar and other

unknown persons who altogether are indulged in the business of drugs, under their preplanned conspiracy has murdered my daughter Amarjit Kaur Babbu. I after asking my nephew namely Kirtan Singh son of Jagir Singh to stay near the dead body was coming towards you for recording my statement. You have met at Goal Chowk Dharamkot. Kindly take action. I have read and heard it as correct. LTI/ Kashmir Singh verified SD/ Jangir Singh (Brother) Attested SD/ Jaswinder Singh INSP SHO PS Dharmakot dated 23.03.2023.'

3. **Contentions**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that there is a delay of 01 day in lodging the instant FIR as the occurrence took place on 22.03.2023 whereas the FIR was registered on 23.03.2023. It has been further contended on behalf of the petitioner that the complainant namely Kashmir Singh and witness namely Jangir Singh have not supported the case of the prosecution before the learned trial Court, as is evident from Annexure P-3. It has been further asserted that co-accused namely Gurpreet Singh, Kuldeep Singh and Gurwinder Singh @ Gori have already been granted the concession of regular/anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 31.07.2024 (Annexure P-4), 28.11.2024 (Annexure P-5) and 05.04.2025 (Annexure P-6) passed in CRM-M-31031-2024, CRM-M-54038-2024 and CRR-635-2025 respectively.

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 the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in five other cases. However, he does not controvert the fact that the complainant namely Kashmir Singh and witness namely Jangir Singh have not supported the case of the prosecution.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner i.e. 02 years, 01 month and 22 days added with the facts that there is a delay of 01 day in lodging the instant FIR as the occurrence took place on 22.03.2023 whereas the FIR was registered on 23.03.2023; the complainant namely Kashmir Singh and witness namely Jangir Singh have turned hostile before the learned trial Court, as is evident from Annexure P-3; co-accused namely Gurpreet Singh, Kuldeep Singh and Gurwinder Singh @ Gori have already been granted the concession of regular/anticipatory bail by this Court vide orders dated 31.07.2024 (Annexure P-4), 28.11.2024 (Annexure P-5) and 05.04.2025 (Annexure P-6) passed in CRM-M-31031-2024, CRM-M-54038-2024 and CRR-635-2025 respectively; investigation is complete, wherein after framing of charges on 11.12.2023 out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, 04 witnesses have been examined, which is suffice for this Court to infer that the conclusion of trial shall take considerable time, this Court is of the considering view that detaining the petitioner behind the bars for an indefinite period would serve no purpose.

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**”, **SLP (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.”*

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. **RELIEF:**

In view of the discussions made hereinabove, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on regular bail on him 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

21.05.2025

Poonam Negi

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No