



CRM-M-48026 of 2025

-1-

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

230

**CRM-M-48026 of 2025
Date of Decision: 03.09.2025**

Manish @ Pushiya

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.313 dated 14.10.2024 registered under Sections 191(3), 190, 115(2), 118(1), 110, 351(2) and 126(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Sadar Dadri, District Charkhi Dadri.
2. Brief facts of the present case are that as per the prosecution, on 13.10.2024, the petitioner in connivance with other co-accused, who were armed with weapons, caused injuries to the complainant due to previous enmity with his brother.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not committed any



such offence. He argued that the petitioner has been named in the FIR by the complainant without assigning him any specific role and he is simply stated to be present at the place of alleged occurrence. The petitioner is in custody since 16.10.2024 and nothing has been recovered from him. The investigation in this case is complete and challan also stands presented. Further, co-accused Umesh @ Pistol @ Umesh Kumar and Sumit, who had caused injuries to the complainant in the alleged incident, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide orders dated 16.07.2025 and 12.08.2025 respectively. He further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He has further submitted that the petitioner is also involved in multiple other cases meaning thereby he is an habitual offender.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 10 months; investigation is complete; challan stands presented, and the trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. Keeping the petitioner in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the



CRM-M-48026 of 2025

-3-

near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

7. This Court is sanguine of the fact that according to the proposition settled by the Apex Court in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.

8. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"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."

**CRM-M-48026 of 2025****-4-**

9. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

03.09.2025*D.Bansal***(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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