



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

225

CRM-M-51459-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.09.2025

MANISH KUMAR

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Parvej Chugh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nitin, Advocate for the complainant.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the 2nd present petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.83 dated 19.04.2018, registered at Police Station Mataur, District SAS Nagar, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC and Section 24 of Immigration Act.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for about 8 months. He alleges false implication. He was only an associate and the proprietor of the firm is one Harjinder Singh, who has received the amount. The matter has now been settled with the complainant vide compromise deed, Annexure P-7. Charges were framed on 10.09.2025, however, out of 27 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined. It is a case of Magestrial trial. The petitioner is involved in 10 other cases, in 5 of them, the matter has been settled and he is on bail in all cases. 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. The custody certificate dated 17.09.2025, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 7 months and 16 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there were specific allegations against the petitioner as alleged in the FIR. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case and the petitioner being on bail in other cases.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant affirms the factum of compromise and has no objection for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard.

7. 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."



8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 7 months and 16 days; on bail in other cases; charges were framed on 10.09.2025, however, out of 27 prosecution witnesses none has yet 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.

11. 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

19.09.2025
Deepak Patwal

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable | Yes/No |