

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-1935-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 02.02.2023

Mahesh Narang

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Kodan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana,
assisted by SI Manoj Kumar.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No. 63 dated 24.01.2022 at Police Station 32-33, Karnal, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 166, 218, 120-B, 201 IPC, Sections 7, 7A, 8 and 13 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Section 12 of the Passport Act, 1967.
2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that the petitioner had been facilitating issuance of passports to various persons on the basis of forged documents.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the present case and that in any case, the passport had been issued after following due procedure including verification by the police. It has also been submitted that the petitioner came to be nominated in the instant FIR on account of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the petition has submitted that in the present case some of the police officials were also hand & gloves with other accused and that false verification reports have been made in favour of the applicants (applicant for issuance of a passport) even though the said applicants were not residing at the given addresses. Learned State counsel has also submitted that the petitioner stands involved in 6 other cases and in these circumstances, do not deserve the concession of bail. Learned State counsel have, however, informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 1 year and that charges are yet to be framed and as many as 30 PWs have been cited.
5. This Court has considered rival submissions.
6. Without commenting anything as regards the merits of the case, but having regard to the custody of the petitioner, which is about one year and also the fact that conclusion of trial is likely to take some time inasmuch as the trial has not even commenced till date and as many as 30 PWs have been cited, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

02.02.2023

mohan

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No