



-IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-32684-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 24.09.2025

SANDEEP KUMAR . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus

STATE OF HARYANA . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Sandeep Singh Jattan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sandeep Kumar	454	28.11.2024	467, 468, 471, 120-B, 201 (added later on) of IPC and 12(1) of the Passport Act, 1967	Sadar Gohana	Sonepat

2. Allegation against the petitioner is that one Aman succeeded in obtained a passport from Delhi Passport Centre with passport No.Y2170295 having been issued on 06.05.2024, and fled abroad using this passport. Aman was facing some criminal cases including the case of murder. The name of the petitioner though not mentioned in the FIR but during



investigation, prosecution built up a story that the petitioner recommended Aman to one Vijender Jain and thereupon said Virender Jain got prepared the passport on the basis of false and forged documents in regard to the identity of said Aman. Learned counsel further argues that except this allegation, there is no other allegation against the petitioner. All the offences are triable by learned Magistrate. Petitioner is inside jail since 27.03.2025 and culmination of trial shall take considerable time. Therefore, petitioner prays for grant of regular bail.

3 On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that as per investigation done by the investigating officer, petitioner recommended Aman to Vijender Jain and for that purpose he had been paid Rs.5,00,000/-. It is also informed that there are five other cases registered against the petitioner and out of those, one is of similar nature. However, he does not dispute that as per investigation, petitioner was not that person, who identified or signed the documents in facilitating the main accused Aman to flee abroad.

4. I have gone through the record and documents appended with the petition and also heard respective counsel.

5. Heard.

6. This Court finds that offences are triable by learned Magistrate and culmination of trial is likely to take considerable time. Charges are also required to be proved against the petitioner beyond shadow of reasonable doubt. Moreover the allegations against the petitioner is of only recommending the main accused Aman to some other person namely,



Vijender Jain for preparation of the fake passport, which further enabled the accused to flee abroad. So far as other cases are concerned, petitioner has been released on bail in those cases. Therefore, liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period.

In the given circumstances, I find it appropriate to entertain the petitioner's plea for regular bail, as it pertains to the fundamental question of an individual's liberty.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 24, 2025

Deepak Patwal

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No