



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

105

CRM-M-45760-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 29.08.2025

Amit Malik @ Bhura

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present : Ms. Medha Kaushal, Advocate for  
Mr. Adarsh Priyadarshi, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG Punjab  
\*\*\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.0003 dated 01.05.2019, registered under Sections 377, 388, 389, 109, 115, 116, 120-B IPC at Police Station State Special Operations Cell, SAS Nagar, District Intelligence Wing (CID).

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner had been in custody for 4 years and about 9 months, when he was granted interim bail on 06.03.2024. She alleges false implication. The allegations against him are of beating up the complainant and no offence under Section 377 IPC as alleged was committed. He has never misused the concession of interim bail so granted or threatened the witnesses. Out of 18 prosecution witnesses, only 4 have been examined. The petitioner is involved in other cases, wherein he is 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.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. However, on instructions submits that there is no complaint with regard to misusing the liberty granted by this Court and is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case and he being on bail in other cases.

4. Heard.

5. 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."

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner had remained in custody for 3 years, 10 months and 24 days; on interim bail for the last 1 year and about 6 months; on bail in other cases; out of 18 prosecution witnesses only 4 have been examined so far, 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.



9. 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**

**29.08.2025**

M.Kamra

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