



252

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

**CRM-M No.46552 of 2025
Date of decision : 28.08.2025**

Roshan Lal

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Vikas P. Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

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.13, dated 17.01.2025, under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Bhiwani.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Monika daughter of Ramniwas. It was alleged that she had done primary education from Seth Janki Dass, Girl Senior Secondary School, Sui. She applied for the post of Gramin Dak Sewak advertised by the Department of Posts, Ministry of Communications, Government of India. However she did not get selected. On 04.10.2024, she received a call from her school-Seth



Janki Dass Girls Senior Secondary School, Sui, from the Headmaster, who informed that her document verification has come to school from Nagaur, Rajasthan. On reaching the school, she found that some other girl of the same name, Monika, daughter of Ramniwas had got re-issued her mark sheet of 10th standard which she never applied. It was found that the name of parents of that Monika was also the same, which was of her parents. She realized that fraud has been committed with her by that another Monika by getting the 10th mark sheet of her re-issued in her name. The request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the said Monika was arrested and complicity of the petitioner also surfaced as he hatched the criminal conspiracy with other accused got issued duplicate marksheet to the co-accused Monika in the name of complainant. Thus, he was also arrayed as an accused in the present case and was arrested on 28.05.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 18.08.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has



submitted that the petitioner has been implicated in this case during the investigation on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He has submitted that the petitioner is not even the beneficiary of the alleged mark sheet, which was re-issued in the name of complainant. He has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 28.05.2025. He has submitted that co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Pinki @ Meghna has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 31.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-36140-2025 and thus, case of the petitioner is at par with that of the co-accused. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He, on instructions, has submitted that the petitioner has played an active role in committing the offence. e, on instructions has submitted that out of 29 prosecution witnesses, only one witness, i.e. the complainant, has been examined till date. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner dated 27.08.2025 today in the Court and the same is taken on record. He has endorsed the fact that co-accused of the petitioner has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 31.07.2025.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrayed as an accused in the present case during the investigation. The petitioner was arrested on



28.05.2025 and since then, he is behind the bars. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 02 months and 29 days as on 27.08.2025. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Co-accused of the petitioner has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 31.07.2025.

8. 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.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail on parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her 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.

28.08.2025

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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