

105+206+207

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: 16th December, 2022

1. CRM-M-52038-2022 (O&M)

Amit @ RD

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

2. CRM-M-53479-2022 (O&M)

Bijender

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Ms. Pooja Jaglan, Advocate and
Mr. Rajesh Goyal, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

CRM-47436-2022 in CRM-M-52038-2022

This is an application for correction of head note and prayer in CRM-M-52038-2022 in FIR No. 222, dated 24th December, 2021, under Sections 120-B, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Sanoli, District Panipat, wherein in the headnote and in prayer only Sections 120-B, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 are mentioned and Section 7 and 13(1) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 which were added later on are not mentioned.

Notice in the application.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana appearing on advance

prayer of the applicant.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Office is directed to carry out the necessary corrections.

Main cases

These two petitions are filed seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 222, dated 24th December, 2021, under Sections 120-B, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 7 and 13(1) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 added later on, registered at Police Station Sanoli, District Panipat.

2. As per the case set up, a secret information was received at Police Station Sanoli, Panipat that Vikas has procured passport impersonating himself as Deepak on the basis of forged documents. The role attributed to the petitioners is that on asking of co-villager had signed as witness on passport verification.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are in custody since 23rd June, 2022; no recovery was made from them and conclusion of the trial is likely to take time.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail though on instructions is not in a position to dispute the role attributed to the petitioners.

5. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, having conspectus of facts of the case and that petitioners are not having criminal antecedent, conclusion of trial is likely to take time, the petitioners are granted bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

The petitions are allowed.

7. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
8. Since the main petitions are allowed, pending applications, if any rendered infructuous.
9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

16th December, 2022
Parveen Sharma

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