



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

218

CRM-M-5339-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 17.11.2025

Vikram Mann ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Dharamveer Phour, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Gursimar Singh, Advocate,
Mr. Jaskaran Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Sukhmani Chandok, Advocate for the complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.380 dated 15.05.2024, registered under Sections 420, 441, 467, 468, 471, 120-B and 506 of IPC, 1860, at Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 23.09.2024 and the offences are triable by Magistrate; charges have already been framed, however, for the last six months, no prosecution witness has been examined till date; and petitioner is not involved in any other criminal activity except the present one. As per the case of prosecution, it is an attempt to sell the property on the basis of forged property ID; and the trial will take sufficient time to conclude. Co-accused,



CRM-M-5339-2025 (O&M) (2)

namely, Sanjeev @ Sanjeev Kumar and Ashok Kumar, have already been granted concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide common order dated 30.09.2024 passed in CRM-M-34692-2024 and CRM-M-34863-2024 respectively. Hence, learned counsel prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail petition of the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner is the main accused as he had created forged property ID of the house in dispute, which belongs to the complainant, and after forging the property ID, he entered into an agreement to sell with co-accused. Thus, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of his bail petition.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has been behind bars for the last about 1 year and 2 months; the present case is based upon documentary evidence; offences are triable by Magistrate; there is no material on file to show that he is involved in any other criminal activity: and co-accused, namely, Sanjeev @ Sanjeev Kumar and Ashok Kumar, have already been granted concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide common order dated 30.09.2024 referred to above, there is no apprehension that after release, the petitioner will tamper with the prosecution evidence; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception,



CRM-M-5339-2025 (O&M) (3)

this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

17.11.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No