

CRM-M-43240-2025 (O & M)

2025:PHHC:146328



::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(223)

CRM-M-43240-2025 (O & M)

Date of decision: 27.10.2025

Mohd. Jameel @ Jeelu

..... Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Ankit Joshi, Advocate, and
Mr. Usman Chaudhary, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.143 dated 27.09.2023 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station City 1, Malerkotla, District Malerkotla.

2. The brief facts of the case are that Manpreet Kaur @ Priya Mahant submitted forged documents at the time of furnishing her surety bonds. During interrogation, she disclosed that she had given a sum of Rs.35,000/- to Mohd. Jameel @ Jeelu (petitioner) for furnishing her surety bonds.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Manpreet Kaur @ Priya Mahant has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 25.02.2025 passed in CRM-M-5902-2025. The petitioner is in



::2::

custody since 25.02.2025 but none of the 16 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. The case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate. As the Trial is not likely to be concluded anytime soon, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, while referring to the reply dated 18.09.2025 which is already on record contends that the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner does not entitle him to the concession as prayed for. He, however, concedes that a co-accused/Manpreet Kaur @ Priya Mahant has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail, that he is in custody since 25.02.2025, that none of the 16 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and that the case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. This Court in the case titled as ***Maninder Sharma Vs. State Tax Officer, State, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab bearing CRM-M24033-2021(O&M) Decided on 31.08.2022*** has held as under:-

“Therefore, broadly speaking (subject to any statutory restrictions contained in Special Acts) , in economic offences involving the IPC or Special Acts or cases triable by Magistrates once the investigation is complete, final report/complaint filed and the triple test is satisfied then denial of bail must be the exception rather than the rule. However, this would not prevent the Court from granting bail even prior to the completion of investigation if the facts so warrant.”

7. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated during the course of the Trial.



::3::

Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 25.02.2025 but none of the 16 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. The present case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate and no serious apprehension has been expressed by the State that the petitioner would abscond from justice, tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses if granted the concession of bail. Therefore, in this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required, moreso, when a co-accused has been granted the similar concession of bail.

8. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Mohd. Jameel @ Jeelu is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. The present petition stands disposed of.

10. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

October 27, 2025
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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