

221 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-36432-2023

Date of Decision: 02.08.2023

Raghuveer Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. J.P.Sharma, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant a regular bail in case FIR No.51 dated 01.04.2022 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC at Police Station Satnali, District Mahendergarh (Annexure P-1).

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the year 2006, an accident had taken place and one FIR No.11 dated 05.02.2006 under Sections 279, 337, 304-A IPC at Police Station Satnali, District Mahendergarh was registered against Sardar Singh for causing the said accident. Later on, on investigation the police found that Ombir, the complainant had caused the said accident and was arrayed as an accused. Now, Ombir has got the present FIR registered against the present petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had impersonated him and was appearing in the trial Court in his place. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that Ombir has nominated the

petitioner as an accused in the present case, due to enmity and he had no concern with the alleged crime. Even otherwise, the entire case is based on documentary evidence and the same has already been recovered by the police. He was arrested in the present case on 31.05.2023 and the investigation is almost complete in the present case.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the present petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

It is not in dispute that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 31.05.2023 and apparently, the present case is based on documentary evidence, which already stands recovered by the police during the course of investigation. Still further, all the offences in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate and further custody of the petitioner will serve no meaningful purpose.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

02.08.2023
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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