



CRA-D-478-2021 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

115

CRA-D-478-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision : 19.07.2024

Manjit Singh @ Manga

... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.. Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LAPITA BANERJI**

Present:- Mr. R.S. Bains, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Aarushi Garg, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Deepender Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Sandhu, Special Prosecutor
for the respondent/NIA.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The appellant has challenged the order dated 14.07.2021 passed by the Special Judge, NIA, SAS Nagar whereby his bail application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in FIR No.152 dated 19.10.2018, registered under Sections 124A, 153A, 153B, 120-B IPC, Sections 17/18/19 Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 [for short, 'UAPA'], Section 25/54/59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Sultan Wind, has been dismissed.

2. Learned Senior counsel for the appellant submits that the allegation against the appellant is that he had been funding the activities of 'Sikhs for Justice' which is an organisation banned under UAPA but the FIR was registered in the year 2018 and at that time, 'Sikhs for Justice' had not been banned as an



organisation. It was declared unlawful by notification dated 10.07.2019 which was approved by UAPA Tribunal on 06.01.2020. He further submits that even if the organisation was banned and the applicant is alleged to be a member of a banned organisation, that by itself would not constitute an offence under UAPA unless he has committed acts which constitute an offence under UAPA. The applicant is running a charitable organisation and organises marriages for underprivileged girls for which he had received funds from abroad and the respondents have not been able to point out that any source from whom the applicant had received funds had dubious credentials. He has performed over 40 marriages, the details of which are set out in Para 9 of the appeal. The photographs and other certificates/documents including self-declaration form contain the details of the couples whose marriages were collectively performed by the appellant during the years 2016 to 2018 have also been enclosed.

3. The recovery which has been allegedly effected from the appellant and other co-accused includes 05 cloth banners, 03 cloth banners moulds, 12 mobile phones from 11 accused. A country made pistol has been recovered from co-accused Rahul Gill. Two wine shops' shutters along with photographs are alleged to have been burnt by co-accused Bikramjeet Singh. He further submits that the allegations with regard to the appellant are different from the allegations levelled against co-accused Gurwinder Singh whose appeal had been dismissed on 24.04.2023 by the Coordinate Bench in CRA-D-144 of 2022 and the appeal thereagainst had also been dismissed by the Supreme Court on 07.02.2024. The co-accused Gurwinder Singh had been charged of having gone to Kashmir to procure



weapons to be used in unlawful activities while no such allegation has been levelled against the appellant.

4. Furthermore, there are no allegations that the appellant has funded any terrorist or violent activities and no incriminating material either in the form of arms and ammunition or drugs etc. has been recovered from the appellant. He also submits that the appellant is in custody for over 05 years and 09 months. In support of his submissions, he has placed reliance upon the judgments of the Supreme Court in the cases of **Union of India versus K.A. Najeeb, (2021) 3 SCC 713** and **Shoma Kanti Sen versus State of Maharashtra and another, 2024 SCCOnline SC 498**, wherein it has been held that long custody by itself would entitle the accused under UAPA to grant of bail by invoking Article 21 of the Constitution of India. He has also relied upon the judgments of the Supreme Court in the cases of **Vernon versus The State of Maharashtra and another, 2023 SCCOnline 885**, **Sheikh Javed Iqbal @ Ashfaq Ansari @ Javed Ansari versus State of Uttar Pradesh**, bearing Criminal Appeal No.2790 of 2024, decided on 18.07.2024 and **Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh versus State of Maharashtra, another**, bearing Criminal Appeal No.2787 of 2024, decided on 03.07.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent/NIA submits that the appellant had been receiving funds from abroad and utilizing them for propagating the agenda of 'Sikhs for Justice'. The statements of protected witnesses in this regard have been recorded. He further submits that the banner of 'Khalistan Zindabad' and 'Khalistan Referendum, 2020' had been put on the pillars of Kot Mit Singh Flyover at Amritsar. Two persons, namely, Sukhraj and Malkeet Singh had been apprehended from the spot and in their disclosure, they had disclosed the role of



the appellant and others. The funds received by the appellant were being used for terrorist activities and other preparatory acts to procure weapons to spread terror in India and to misguide the gullible youth. A sum of Rs.14.63 lakhs is alleged to have been transferred in the account of the appellant from different sources from abroad from 2016 to 2018. The marriage of the girls allegedly performed by the appellant had taken place prior to October, 2017 whereas he had received a sum of Rs.9 lacs even thereafter which has not been accounted for. The appeal preferred by co-accused Gurwinder Singh had been dismissed by the Coordinate Bench on 24.04.2023 in CRA-D-144-2022 and the SLP thereagainst was also dismissed by the Supreme Court on 07.02.2024. The appellant had also received money from one Pakistan National based in Dubai. He also submits that the charges were framed on 09.12.2021 and 23 out of 117 witnesses have been examined.

6. Heard.

7. We are conscious of the fact that an accused under UAPA cannot be granted bail unless the conditions set out under Section 43-D(5) of UAPA are satisfied. The allegations against the appellant are that he had received funds to the tune of Rs.14.63 lakhs during the period 2016-2019 which have been allegedly used to fund terrorist activities across the country. However, no recovery of any incriminating material either in the form of weapons, firearms, drugs or any other objectionable material has been effected from the appellant. He is said to have performed marriages of underprivileged girls which is denied only to the extent that marriages were not performed after October, 2017 and a sum of Rs.9 lakhs received thereafter is unaccounted.



8. Article 21 of the Constitution of India enshrines the fundamental right to protection of life and liberty which also includes the right to speedy trial, which is sacrosanct. It has been held by the Supreme Court in a catena of judgments that long custody by itself would entitle the accused under UAPA to the grant of bail by invoking Article 21 of the Constitution of India. In the instant case only 23 out of 117 witnesses have been examined. The charges were framed on 09.12.2021 and it has taken over 2 ½ years to examine 23 witnesses. It would be difficult to hazard a guess about the conclusion of trial, when 94 witnesses are yet to be examined. The appellant is in custody for about 05 years and 09 months. The Constitutional Court would like to prevent a situation where the lengthy and arduous process of trial, becomes the punishment in itself. Reference can be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of **Union of India versus K.A. Najeeb (supra)** wherein it has been held that long custody would be an essential factor while granting bail under UAPA. Article 21 of the Constitution of India provides right to speedy trial and long period of incarceration would be a good ground to grant bail to an under-trial for an offence punishable under UAPA. It has also been held that the embargo under Section 43-D of UAPA would not negate the powers of the Court to give effect to Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The relevant extract of the judgement is reproduced hereunder:-

“It is thus clear to us that the presence of statutory restrictions like Section 43-D(5) of UAPA *per se* does not oust the ability of Constitutional Courts to grant bail on grounds of violation of Part III of the Constitution. Whereas at commencement of proceedings, the Courts are expected to appreciate the legislative policy against grant of bail but the rigours of such provisions will melt down where there is no likelihood of trial being completed within a reasonable time and



the period of incarceration already undergone has exceeded a substantial part of the prescribed sentence. Such an approach would safeguard against the possibility of provisions like Section 43-D(5) of UAPA being used as the sole metric for denial of bail or for wholesale breach of constitutional right to speedy trial.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Instead, Section 43-D(5) of UAPA merely provides another possible ground for the competent Court to refuse bail, in addition to the well-settled considerations like gravity of the offence, possibility of tampering with evidence, influencing the witnesses or chance of the accused evading the trial by absconsion etc.”

9. In the case of **Shoma Kanti Sen(supra)**, the Supreme Court has held that generally pre-conviction detention at the investigation stage is necessary to maintain purity in the course of trial and also to prevent an accused from being a fugitive from justice or to prevent further commission of an offence. Once it is apparent that a timely trial is not possible and the accused has suffered incarceration for a significant period of time, the Court would ordinarily be obligated to enlarge them on bail as any form of deprivation of liberty must be proportionate to the facts of the case and also follow a just and fair procedure. A balance must be made between the prosecution’s right to lead evidence of its choice and establish the charges beyond any doubt and simultaneously, the respondent’s rights guaranteed under Part-III of the Constitution. The relevant extract thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

“This Court has already accepted right of an accused under the said offences of the 1967 Act to be enlarged on bail founding such right on [Article 21](#) of the Constitution of India. This was in the case of Najeeb (supra), and in that judgment, long period of incarceration was held to be a valid ground to enlarge an accused on bail in spite of the bail-



restricting provision of Section 43D (5) of the 1967 Act. Pre-conviction detention is necessary to collect evidence (at the investigation stage), to maintain purity in the course of trial and also to prevent an accused from being fugitive from justice. Such detention is also necessary to prevent further commission of offence by the same accused. Depending on gravity and seriousness of the offence alleged to have been committed by an accused, detention before conclusion of trial at the investigation and post-chargesheet stage has the sanction of law broadly on these reasonings. But any form of deprivation of liberty results in breach of [Article 21](#) of the Constitution of India and must be justified on the ground of being reasonable, following a just and fair procedure and such deprivation must be proportionate in the facts of a given case. These would be the overarching principles which the law Courts would have to apply while testing prosecution's plea of pre-trial detention, both at investigation and post-chargesheet stage.”

10. The Supreme Court in the case of **Vernon versus The State of Maharashtra and another(supra)** has held that serious allegations against accused by itself cannot be a reason to deny bail to the accused. The relevant extract thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

“In the case of Zahoor Ahmad Shah Watali (supra) reference was made to the judgment of Jayendra Saraswathi Swamigal -vs- State of Tamil Nadu [(2005) 2 SCC 13) in which, citing two earlier decisions of this court in the cases of State -vs- Jagjit Singh (AIR 1962 SC 253) and Gurcharan Singh -vs- State of (UT of Delhi) [(1978) 1 SCC 118), the factors for granting bail under normal circumstances were discussed. It was held that the nature and seriousness of the offences, the character of the evidence, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, a reasonable possibility of the presence of the accused not being secured at the trial; reasonable apprehension of witnesses being tempered with; the larger interest of the public or the State would be



relevant factors for granting or rejecting bail. **Juxtaposing the appellants' case founded on Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India with the aforesaid allegations and considering the fact that almost five years have lapsed since they were taken into custody, we are satisfied that the appellants have made out a case for granting bail. Allegations against them no doubt are serious, but for that reason alone bail cannot be denied to them. While dealing with the offences under Chapters IV and VI of the 1967 Act, we have referred to the materials available against them at this stage. These materials cannot justify continued detention of the appellants, pending final outcome of the case under the others provisions of the 1860 Code and the 1967 Act."**

11. In the case of **Sheikh Javed Iqbal @ Ashfaq Ansari @ Javed Ansari versus State of Uttar Pradesh(supra)**, it has been held that right to life and personal liberty enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India is overarching and sacrosanct. A Constitutional Court cannot be restrained from granting bail to an accused on account of restrictive statutory provisions in a penal statute if it finds that the right of the accused-undertrial under Article 21 of the Constitution of India has been infringed. In that event, such statutory restrictions would not come in the way. Even in the case of interpretation of a penal statute, howsoever stringent it may be, a constitutional court has to lean in favour of constitutionalism and the rule of law, of which liberty is an intrinsic part. The relevant extract thereof is reproduced hereunder:-

"In Gurwinder Singh (supra) on which reliance has been placed by the respondent, a two Judge Bench of this Court distinguished K.A. Najeeb (supra) holding that the appellant in K.A. Najeeb (supra) was in custody for five years and that the trial 25 of the appellant in that case was severed from the other co-accused whose trial had concluded whereupon they were sentenced to imprisonment of eight years; but in



Gurwinder Singh, the trial was already underway and that twenty two witnesses including the protected witnesses have been examined. It was in that context, the two Judge Bench of this Court in Gurwinder Singh observed that mere delay in trial pertaining to grave offences cannot be used as a ground to grant bail.

This Court has, time and again, emphasized that right to life and personal liberty enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India is overarching and sacrosanct. A constitutional court cannot be restrained from granting bail to an accused on account of restrictive statutory provisions in a penal statute if it finds that the right of the accused-undertrial under Article 21 of the Constitution of India has been infringed. In that event, such statutory restrictions would not come in the way. Even in the case of interpretation of a penal statute, howsoever stringent it may be, a constitutional court has to lean in favour of constitutionalism and the rule of law of which liberty is an intrinsic part. In the given facts of a particular case, a constitutional court may decline to grant bail. But it would be very wrong to say that under a particular statute, bail cannot be granted. It would run counter to the very grain of our constitutional jurisprudence. In any view of the matter, K.A. Najeeb (supra) being rendered by a three Judge Bench is binding on a Bench of two Judges like us.

Xxxxxx

continued incarceration of the appellant cannot be justified. ”

12. In the case of **Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh versus State of Maharashtra, another**(supra), the Supreme Court has observed that criminals are not born out but made. Howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has a right to speedy trial as enshrined under the Constitution of India. Moreover, the purpose of bail is only to secure the attendance of the accused at the trial and bail is not to be withheld as a form of punishment. The relevant extract thereof is reproduced hereunder:-



“13. The aforesaid observations have resonated, time and again, in several judgments, such as Kadra Pahadiya & Ors. v. State of Bihar reported in (1981) 3 SCC 671 and Abdul Rehman Antulay v. R.S. Nayak reported in (1992) 1 SCC 225. In the latter the court re-emphasized the right to speedy trial, and further held that an accused, facing prolonged trial, has no option:

“The State or complainant prosecutes him. It is, thus, the obligation of the State or the complainant, as the case may be, to proceed with the case with reasonable promptitude. Particularly, in this country, where the large majority of accused come from poorer and weaker sections of the society, not versed in the ways of law, where they do not often get competent legal advice, the application of the said rule is wholly inadvisable. Of course, in a given case, if an accused demands speedy trial and yet he is not given one, may be a relevant factor in his favour. But we cannot disentitle an accused from complaining of infringement of his right to speedy trial on the ground that he did not ask for or insist upon a speedy trial.”

14. In Mohd Muslim @ Hussain v. State (NCT of Delhi) reported in 2023 INSC 311, this Court observed as under:

“21. Before parting, it would be important to reflect that laws which impose stringent conditions for grant of bail, may be necessary in public interest; yet, if trials are not concluded in time, the injustice wrecked on the individual is immeasurable. Jails are overcrowded and their living conditions, more often than not, appalling. According to the Union Home Ministry’s response to Parliament, the National Crime Records Bureau had recorded that as on 31st December 2021, over 5,54,034 prisoners were lodged in jails against total capacity of 4,25,069 lakhs in the country. Of these 122,852 were convicts; the rest 4,27,165 were undertrials.



22. The danger of unjust imprisonment, is that inmates are at risk of “prisonisation” a term described by the Kerala High Court in [A Convict Prisoner v. State](#) reported in 1993 Cri LJ 3242, as “a radical transformation” whereby the prisoner loses his identity. He is known by a number. He loses personal possessions. He has no personal relationships. Psychological problems result from loss of freedom, status, possessions, dignity any autonomy of personal life. The inmate culture of prison turns out to be dreadful. The prisoner becomes hostile by ordinary standards. Self-perception changes.

23. There is a further danger of the prisoner turning to crime, “as crime not only turns admirable, but the more professional the crime, more honour is paid to the criminal” (also see Donald Clemmer’s ‘The Prison Community’ published in 1940). Incarceration has further deleterious effects - where the accused belongs to the weakest economic strata: immediate loss of livelihood, and in several cases, scattering of families as well as loss of family bonds and alienation from society. The courts therefore, have to be sensitive to these aspects (because in the event of an acquittal, the loss to the accused is irreparable), and ensure that trials – especially in cases, where special laws enact stringent provisions, are taken up and concluded speedily.”

Xxxxxxx

18. Criminals are not born out but made. The human potential in everyone is good and so, never write off any criminal as beyond redemption. This humanist fundamental is often missed when dealing with delinquents, juvenile and adult. Indeed, every saint has a past and every sinner a future. When a crime is committed, a variety of factors is responsible for making the offender commit the crime. Those factors may be social and economic, may be, the result of value erosion or parental neglect; may be, because of the stress of



circumstances, or the manifestation of temptations in a milieu of affluence contrasted with indigence or other privations.”

13. It is true that the appeal of co-accused Gurwinder Singh had been declined by the Coordinate Bench and the SLP had also been dismissed by the Supreme Court. However, it is apt to notice that the allegations against the appellant appear to be different from the allegations levelled against co-accused Gurwinder Singh as the latter was alleged to have gone to Kashmir to procure weapons which were to be used in unlawful activities but there is no such allegation against the present appellant of having gone to Kashmir or any other place for procurement of weapons. The appeal of co-accused Gurwinder Singh had been dismissed by the Coordinate Bench when he had been in custody for over 04 years while the appellant has been in custody for almost 05 years and 09 months.

14. In view of the above especially when the appellant is in custody for 05 years and 09 months and the end of the trial is not in sight, the appeal is allowed and the impugned order is set aside. The appellant is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to following conditions besides furnishing of requisite bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned:-

- (i) He shall furnish bond of ₹10 lakh with two sureties of ₹10 lakh each;
- (ii) He shall surrender his passport in the Trial Court, if he is holding the same and is still with them;
- (iii) He shall appear before Trial Court on each and every date unless exempted by Court;



- (iv) He shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when summoned;
- v) He shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or who is cited as witness;
- vi) He shall not involve in any criminal activity and if during the pendency of trial, he is found involved in commission of any offence punishable under UAPA, the prosecuting agency would be free to approach this court for recalling this order and cancellation of his bail;
- vii) He shall not sell, transfer or in any other manner create third party right over his immovable property;
- viii) He shall furnish an undertaking to the effect that in case of their absence, Trial Court may proceed with trial and he shall not claim re-examination of any witness.
- ix) At the time of release of the appellant, the SHO, Police Station Khadoor Sahib, District Tarn Taran shall be informed. He shall appear before the SHO on every alternate Monday till the conclusion of the trial.

15. In the event there is a breach of any of the abovementioned conditions, or of the conditions to be imposed by the Trial Court independently, it would be open to the prosecution to seek cancellation of the bail of the defaulting appellant without any further reference to this Court. Similarly, if the appellant seeks to threaten or otherwise influence any of the witnesses, whether directly or



indirectly, then also the prosecution shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail of the concerned appellant by making appropriate application before the Trial Court.

16. Needless to observe that the observations made hereinabove are only for the determination of appeal seeking bail and shall have no bearing on the merits of the trial pending before the Special Judge, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

17. Pending application, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

(LAPITA BANERJI)
JUDGE

July 19, 2024

sonia gugnani

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