



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

224

CRM-M-49949-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 20.01.2026

Rocky Malik Alias Rocky

....Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh

...Respondent

CRM-M-60910-2025 (O&M)

Manish Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Shubham Dogra and Mr. Vinay Yadav, Advocates
for the petitioners

Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P., U.T. Chandigarh and
Mr. Dixit Bhardwaj, Advocate for the respondent

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. These cases are disposed of by this common order as they arise out of the same FIR.
2. Prayer in the present petitions filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.45 dated 24.03.2025, registered under Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act and 61(2), 319(2), 338 BNS added later on at Police Station Sector-39, Chandigarh.
3. Learned counsel contends that the petitioners have been in custody for about 10 months. As per the allegations, one live cartridge was recovered from petitioner-Rocky, while petitioner-Manish Kumar is stated to be go between in the police officers and the co-accused Rocky and Gaurav. Co-



accused Jasminder Singh and Samunder have been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 21.08.2025 and 29.08.2025, Annexure P-3 and P-4 respectively. Supplementary challan was presented on 17.01.2026, however, charges have not been framed and in all there are 32 witnesses. Petitioner-Rocky is involved in 1 more case in U.P. while petitioner-Manish Kumar is involved in 4 more cases including 1 under NDPS Act, wherein they are on 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.

4. The custody certificates dated 19.01.2026, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioners are behind bars for 9 months and 27/24 days respectively.

5. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are serious allegations have been leveled against the petitioners under the Arms Act and being the mediator. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case; the petitioner being on bail in other cases and co-accused have been granted bail.

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 petitioners are in custody for the last 9 months and 27/24 days respectively; on bail in other cases; co-accused have been granted bail; supplementary challan was presented on 17.01.2026, however, charges are yet to be framed and in all there are 32 witnesses; the trial is likely to take a considerable time and further incarceration of the petitioners would be violative of their right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petitions are allowed.

9. The petitioners are 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 petitioners will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioners will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioners will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioners shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, they are accused, or for commission of which they are suspected of.
- (v) The petitioners 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 petitioners shall not in any manner misuse her liberty.



- (vii) The petitioners shall furnish their address and mobile number by way of affidavit/s to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, they seek to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioners 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 petitioners.

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 petitioners 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.

12. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

20.01.2026
M.Kamra

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