

3. Per contra learned State counsel submits that petitioner stood surety for accused in the case FIR No. 372 of 2019, Police Station Sector 17 Chandigarh which on verification found to be forged and fabricated. He admitted that the challan has been presented in Court and out of 14 witnesses cited by the prosecution only one witness has been examined.

4. In nutshell the case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had fabricated the documents and impersonated as Kuldeep Singh to stood surety for the accused in the case FIR No. 372 of 2019 (supra) which later on found to be forged and fabricated and when the police traced the surety mentioned in the bonds, it was found that somebody has impersonated by producing the forged documents and had procured the bail.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 31.08.2022 and is not involved in any other case. As stated above the challan in the case has already been presented and trial is going on and out of 14 witnesses cited by the prosecution only one witness has been examined till date and criminal liability if any, would be ascertained after conclusion of trial, which may take sufficient long time and no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner behind bars any longer.

6. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of

prosecution in any manner.

7. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

17.11.2023
Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No