

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

CRM-M-1894-2022

Date of Decision:-08.07.2022

AASH MOHAMMAD @ BABLU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH**

Present:- Mr. Subhash Kumar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana.

**KARAMJIT SINGH, J.** (Oral)

Prayer is for grant of regular bail in case having FIR No.217 dated 27.2.2015 registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station City Panipat District Panipat.

The counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner who is in custody for the last more than 1 year has been falsely implicated in this case. That all the other accused persons have already been granted bail and that it will take time for conclusion of the trial.

The present petitioner is opposed by the State counsel on the ground that petitioner is having criminal history as is detailed in the custody certificate.

I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner as well as by State counsel.

As per the allegations, co-accused Arun Kansal, Gurubaksh Singh and Satpal fraudulently sold 9 'Bighas' and 17 'Biswas' of land owned by Harishvijay, Sashi Bala and Ravi Bala to complainant-Brij Mohan @ Mohan Gupta and his wife Prabha Rani Gupta and at that time the present petitioner impersonated as Harish Vijay while co-accused Pinky and Meena impersonated them as Ravi Bala and Sashi Bala. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 1 year and 2 months and is involved in some other cases also.

Admittedly, the present case is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class and the police has presented challan and now the trial is pending as is clear from the report dated 7.7.2022 furnished by the trial Court. Admittedly, the other co-accused have already been granted concession of bail. The counsel for the petitioner has clarified that the petitioner has been granted bail in all the other criminal cases faced by him. It will take time for the trial to culminate. So, no fruitful purpose is going to be served even if the petitioner is kept in judicial custody for indefinite period. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

( KARAMJIT SINGH )  
JUDGE

08.07.2022  
Gaurav Sorot

|                              |          |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Whether reasoned / speaking? | Yes / No |
| Whether reportable?          | Yes / No |