

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14895-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-26.05.2023

ASHOK KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

-.-

Present:- Mr. Chandan Singh Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanish Girdhar, AAG, Punjab.

-.-

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (Oral)

CRM-16767-2023

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed and the main case is ordered to be taken on board today itself.

Main Case

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail
in a case having FIR No.16 dated 20.1.2022 registered under Sections
177, 181, 199, 200, 419, 420, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471, 474, 120-B
IPC, at Police Station Division No.5, District Ludhiana.

2. The present petition was registered against the petitioner and other accused persons on the ground that they forged certain documents and produced the same in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana and got released co-accused Naresh Sharma on bail by submitting said fake documents along with the surety bonds. During investigation of the case petitioner and co-accused Naresh were arrested.
2. The counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and is custody for the last more than 1 year and the trial is not progressing ahead. So prayer is made that the petitioner be released on bail.
3. The instant petition is resisted by the State counsel, who submits that the accused persons including the petitioner tried to defraud the Court by producing fake documents in support of the personal and surety bonds of co-accused Naresh Sharma. However, the State counsel has not disputed the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and that the trial is at its initial stage.
4. I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties.
5. Admittedly all the offences are triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class and the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 1 year and it will take considerable time for the trial to terminate, so no fruitful purpose is going to be served by prolonging judicial custody of the petitioner for indefinite period.

6. 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.

26.05.2023
Gaurav Sorot

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

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