

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

217

CRM-M-52707-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 08.03.2022

SHARVAN KUMAR SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. MS Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Atul Yadav, Advocate
for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.355 dated 01.07.2010, registered at Police Station Gurgaon City, District Gurugram, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC.

Status report by way of an affidavit dated 21.01.2022 of the Assistant Commissioner of Police, City Gurugram, filed on behalf of the respondent-State, in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that he had impersonated himself as Vivek Kumar (son of the complainant). He further submits that the alleged sale deed regarding the plot was executed in the name of SP Singh and his wife, namely, Beena Singh. Still further, it is submitted that the petitioner has

been in custody since 12.03.2020 and that the challan stands presented and charges also stands framed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner was in the business of preparing the sign boards; that some payment was due to SP Singh and that SP Singh on the pretext of making the payment had called the petitioner and taken some photographs.

On the other hand, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He, however, submits that there are specific allegation of impersonation against the petitioner; that the petitioner had forged voter card and PAN card in the name of Vivek Kumar and that the petitioner had also opened a bank account in the name of Vivek Kumar, in which the sale amount of the plot was deposited and later on transferred to SP Singh. He further submits that all the accused persons have connived with each other and had fraudulently got registered the sale deed. Still further it is submitted that post framing of the charges, prosecution evidence is yet to commence and that there are total 38 prosecution witnesses.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 12.03.2020. The allegations against the petitioner are regarding forging of the documents and impersonating himself as Vivek Kumar (son of the complainant). The amount deposited in the fake account had been transferred to SP Singh.

Prosecution evidence is yet to commence. Thus, the trial of the case would take a long time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

08.03.2022
Aman Jain

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