



CRM-M-9356-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-9356-2025
Date of decision: 12.11.2025

HARCHET SINGH**...PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****...RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Amrit Singh Kang, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.148, dated 28.09.2023, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib

2. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR in the present case originated from the statement of the Reader to the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sandeep Singh Bajwa, Sri Muktsar Sahib. It was alleged in the FIR that, in the case titled *State versus Raj Kumar and others*, all the accused were on bail. A perusal of the record reveals that Manjit Singh had been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 24.05.2023, pursuant to which the bail bonds were submitted, and the surety produced a *jamabandi* along with the relevant verification report. On the verification of the same, it was found that the *jamabandi* documents did not correspond with the official revenue record. Thus, prima facie the bail bonds produced were found to be forged and fabricated. An FIR was thus ordered to be registered, and the petitioner being the



CRM-M-9356-2025

-2-

surety who had produced the said documents for the accused Manjit Singh was arrested on 09.10.2024. On completion of investigation, the challan stands presented and charges have been framed in the trial Court. The petitioner approached the learned trial Court for concession of bail but the same was dismissed vide order dated 03.12.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been arrested in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner had *bonafide* filed the documents that were given to him; however, those documents were later found to be inconsistent with the revenue record. It is submitted that petitioner is behind bars since 09.10.2024. The material witnesses have already been examined. He further submits that the accused, Manjit Singh, was not even released on bail till date. It is submitted that petitioner is involved in two other cases and in one case, he has already been granted bail. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that offence has been committed by the petitioner with the Court wherein he filed forged and fabricated bail bonds. She further submits that out of 15 prosecution witnesses, only 3 have been examined. She has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6 On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner in the present case has been implicated based on an

**CRM-M-9356-2025****-3-**

FIR lodged by the Reader of the Court of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year and 29 days as on 10.11.2025. He is involved in two other cases and in one case, he has already been granted bail. Out of 15 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined. Investigation is complete and charges have been framed.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time.

8. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

12.11.2025
renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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