

**CRM-M-10252-2025 (O&M)****-1-**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

220**CRM-M-10252-2025 (O&M)****Date of decision: 23.05.2025**

Shubham

...Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory Chandigarh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Shubham, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P. U.T., Chandigarh and
Mr. Vaibhav Mittal, Addl. P.P., U.T., Chandigarh.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 460 dated 16.12.2023 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC at Police Station Sector-36, Chandigarh.

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the petitioner was arrested in a case arising out of FIR No. 91 dated 16.05.2022 under Sections 392, 394, 397, 411, 34 IPC registered at Police Station 17, Chandigarh. He was extended benefit of bail subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds. Some fake surety had furnished surety bonds. This fact came to the notice of the Court and it was revealed that co-accused Paramjeet Kaur while identifying herself as Gurpreet Kaur had furnished surety on behalf of the present petitioner and the co-accused



Nirmala Rani had instigated her to do so in connivance with the present petitioner. The petitioner was arrested in this case as well on the allegation of arranging fake sureties. He is in custody since 06.06.2024.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. Since, he himself was in custody in a case bearing FIR No.91 dated 16.05.2022 under Sections 392, 394, 397, 411 and 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Sector 17, Chandigarh and his parents had come to the District Court for furnishing bail and surety bonds. They had met one female who had assured them to complete the formalities to furnish bonds and his mother had given her identity card to that female. The petitioner had no chance to commit the subject offences. He is in custody since long. The subject offences are triable by magistrate. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further custody would not serve any useful purpose. The co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report as well as custody certificate have been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Public Prosecutor for U.T., Chandigarh that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. There are chances of his absconding, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. This court heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 06.06.2024. Trial would take time to conclude since, only one out of the 19 prosecution witnesses has



been examined so far. In the considered opinion of this Court, no useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified nothing discussed above shall have any bearing on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

23.05.2025

poonam

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No