

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

CRM-M-33941-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-17.1.2023

Raman Chaudhary

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Yadwinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.25, dated 23.1.2020 at Police Station Rai, District Sonipat, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, Section 12 of Passport Act, 1976 and Section 7 of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that one Raju @ Raj Kumar had been able to get a passport issued i.e. passport bearing No.T5136322 on the basis of forged and fabricated documents in the name of Gurveer Singh son of Balwant Singh. It is alleged that the said forged and fabricated documents were verified by the police officials i.e. Constable Rajender and MHC Sukhwant Singh to be the genuine documents, who as a matter of fact were conniving with the other accused and had incorrectly verified the said documents to be correct. It is further the case of prosecution that initially

only Raju @ Raj Kumar was named in the FIR. Upon arrest of Raju @ Raju Kumar, he disclosed the name of Rajender to be the accused. Upon arrest of Rajender, he suffered a disclosure statement nominating Raman Chaudhary (petitioner) and Sukhwant Singh also as accused. When the petitioner came to be arrested, he disclosed that he used to prepare fake Aadhar Cards by editing the photographs with the help of his laptop and also prepared fake matriculation certificates and had prepared the matriculation certificate of Raju @ Raj Kumar in the name of Gurveer Singh with the help of his laptop.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statements, which would hardly carry any evidentiary value. It has further been submitted that since co-accused Rajender and Sukhwant Singh have already been granted bail vide common order dated 12.7.2022 passed in CRM-M-2520-2022, the petitioner also deserves the same relief on grounds of parity.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that in the present case, apart from the disclosure statements, there is recovery of laptop of the petitioner, which has incriminating documents stored in it and which clearly shows the complicity of the petitioner. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 2 years and that trial has not commenced till date. It has also been informed that the petitioner otherwise happens to be involved in one more case.
5. Without commenting anything as regards merits of the case but while noticing the custody of the petitioner i.e. about 2 years and that the trial has not even commenced till date, further detention of the petitioner will not

serve any useful purpose as conclusion of trial is likely to consume time. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

17.1.2023

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No