



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13782-2025
DECIDED ON: 17.03.2025

MANJEET SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.281, dated 23.04.2021, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B and 201 IPC, registered at Police Station City Sonapat, Sonapat.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“To The Station House Officer. Police Station City. Sonipat. Sir. today 1. Sub Inspector Ramniwas No.436/Rohtak was present in the Office of Chief Minister Flying Squad, Rohtak, when an information was received through secret sources that in the office of Sub Divisional Officer Office (Civil) Sonipat, fake documents have been prepared for stolen vehicles from other States and their wrong registration has been done. Such stolen vehicles are sold further by a gang in connivance with the employees of the

said office by showing valid registration on the basis of wrong documents. 02 such vehicles No.HR-10AC-2704 and HR-10AE-6629 are registered in Sonipat Authority in the name of Shri Ravindra son of Shri Daljit Singh, resident of Patel Nagar Sonipat. Considering the information to be true and reliable, the higher officers were informed and I, Sub Inspector alongwith fellow employee Sub Inspector Karambir Singh No.428/Rohtak, Sub Inspector Sunil Kumar No.216/Rohtak in Government vehicle No.HR-68B-3002 reached the office of Sub Divisional Officer (Civil) Sonipat, where Mrs. Shashi Vasundara, HCS Officer Office (Civil) Sonipat was found valid. The online NOC of both the above vehicles has not been updated intentionally. The original record files of both the above vehicles have been destroyed in order to destroy evidence. Checking of documents related to vehicle registration is done by the Motor Registration clerk and online update is the responsibility of the Computer Operator). In the above matter, the owner of both the vehicles, Ravindra son of Shri Daljit Singh, in connivance with Shri Krishna Kumar, the then Motor Registration Clerk and Shri Manjeet Singh, the then Computer Operator and other persons, has prepared fake documents and registered the vehicles wrongly and tampered with the files from the records and has committed the offence under sections 420, 467, 468, 471. 201, 120B IPC. If involvement of any other employee or person is found, then action may be taken as per rules in the investigation. On receiving the information, Sub Inspector Bijender Singh No.1215/Sonipat along with fellow employees from Sonipat City Police Station has appeared.”

3. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner's role was that he was appointed as the Data Entry Operator, responsible for

uploading vehicle details based on the verified documents as provided to him. He further contends that the prosecution has failed to present any incriminating evidence linking the petitioner to the offence, which could be classified under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, and 201 of the IPC.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, who seeks dismissal of the instant petition on the ground that the petitioner played an active role in the alleged commissioning of the offence as he along with his co-accused persons have prepared forged documents of stolen vehicles, and valid registration was done by a gang and the same are being sold at higher prices.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, considering the fact that the no incriminating material has been put forth by the prosecution to connect the petitioner with the alleged commissioning of the offence added to the fact that the petitioner was working only as a Data Entry Operator, was only responsible for uploading vehicle details based on the verified documents provided to him, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail at this stage as nothing is to be recovered from him as the material evidence is of documentary nature.

5. **Relief**

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction as the custodial interrogation of the

petitioner is not required, therefore, no purpose would be served by putting him behind the bars. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

17.03.2025

Poonam Negi

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No