



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-46046-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 31.10.2025

Manish

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana

Mr. Neeraj Saini, Advocate for the complainant

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.207 dated 17.05.2019, registered under Sections 302, 120-B and 34 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act at Police Station City Jhajjar, District Jhajjar.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for about 6 years. Similar circumstanced co-accused namely Deepak had been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 28.10.2024, Annexure P-8, after being in custody for 4 years, 10 months and 2 days. Co-accused Jaivir Singh @ Jaila, who had the motive as he was having a dispute with the deceased with regard to the ownership of a plot, has also been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 26.07.2023, Annexure P-7, after being in custody for 3 years and about 9 months. Charges have been framed on 15.09.2021, however, out of 36 prosecution witnesses, 16 (including all material witnesses) have been examined. In most of



the cases registered against the petitioner, he is either on bail or has undergone the sentence, except in FIR No.551 of 2019. The aforesaid co-accused were also involved in other cases, which were taken note in the orders granting them bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. Status report along with custody certificate dated 28.10.2025 and 30.10.2025, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 5 years, 11 months and 25 days.

4. Learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant oppose the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having fired at the deceased along with Deepak and Anil @ Leela (since deceased) and recovery of weapon stands effected from all of them. However, learned State counsel is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage, co-accused having been granted bail and the petitioner being on bail in all cases except 1.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court, etc." Reiterating in **Prabhakar Tewari vs. State of UP and another**, (2020) 11 SCC 648, it was observed that, "The offence alleged no doubt is grave and serious and there are several criminal cases pending against the accused. These factors by themselves



cannot be the basis for refusal of prayer for bail.”

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 5 years, 11 months and 25 days; on bail in some cases; co-accused are on bail; charges stand framed wayback on 15.09.2021, however, 20 prosecution witnesses still remain and all material witnesses have been examined, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

8. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.

(ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

31.10.2025
M.Kamra

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