



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

238

CRM-M-58813-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 02.12.2024

Tajinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.410 dated 28.10.2020 under Sections 420, 421, 466, 467, 468, 471, 167, 120B of the IPC read with Section 12 of the Passport Act and Sections 7, 8, 13(2) of the PC Act registered at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar Mohali.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case for allegedly procuring passport by claiming himself to be a resident of Zirakpur instead of Kurukshetra. Learned counsel has submitted that in fact it was co-accused Gurminder Singh and Raman Kumar, travel agents, who had been approached by the petitioner for getting his passport made and it was said Gurminder Singh and Raman Kumar, who had filled in the particulars/details of the petitioner in the



CRM-M-58813-2024 (O&M)

application form of the Regional Passport Office. It has still further been submitted that the passport in question was prepared way back in the year 2018 and the petitioner came to know about the registration of the FIR in question only on 06.10.2024 when he was flying to USA.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has not disputed that the FIR in question was registered way back on 28.10.2020. Learned State counsel has submitted that a complaint was made by the officials of Community Policing, SAS Nagar (Mohali), to the effect that some persons had managed to procure passports on the basis of forged and fabricated documents; during investigation it surfaced that the petitioner was also one of those persons. Learned State counsel on instructions has submitted that investigation in the present case is complete as challan stands presented. It has also not been disputed by the learned State counsel that the entire case of the prosecution hinges on documentary evidence. Learned State counsel has, on further instructions, submitted that as many as 19 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 06.10.2024; investigation qua him is complete. The entire case of the prosecution hinges on documentary evidence, which as not disputed by the learned State counsel is already part of the challan, hence, there can be no apprehension of the petitioner tampering with evidence. It has also not



CRM-M-58813-2024 (O&M)

been disputed by the learned State counsel that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

CRM-46614-2024

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the instant application has been rendered infructuous as the petitioner has been granted regular bail and may be disposed of as such.

8. Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

02.12.2024

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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