



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

233

CRM-M-55860-2025
Date of decision: 10.11.2025

AJAY ALIAS GOPAL

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF U.T CHANDIGARH

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP, UT, Chandigarh.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. Present petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.21 dated 19.02.2025, under Section 341(3) and 197, 316(5), 318, 320, 323 (added later on) of the BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Sector 11, UT, Chandigarh.
2. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by BS Rawat, Assistant Security Officer, PGIMER, Chandigarh, with the allegations that on 18.02.2025 at about 3:30 pm, one Sunpreet, (employee at Amrit Pharmacy of PGIMER) brought a suspect namely Raman Kumar to the Security Control Room PGIMER and said suspect was using one Ayushman Bharat Indent Book belonging to Urology Ward of PGIMER, which raised suspicion. On checking, 08 forged rubber stamps and Indent Book were recovered from his possession, which bore the names of Nursing Officers and Senior Residents from the Ayushman Bharat Himcare Pharmacy. Said Raman Kumar was handed over to



- 2-

the police along with recovered articles and he sought action against the accused. During investigation, Raman Kumar was released on police bail and thereafter, one Sunil was arrested, who was also released on police bail. On 06.03.2025, co-accused namely Balram was arrested and 08 stamp seals, 04 indent books and huge quantity of medicines were recovered from his possession. He disclosed that he had prepared the forged stamps of different departments of PGIMER through Sunil and also procured the indent books of PGIMER and managed the patient cards. He also deals with Rahul, worker of Amrit Pharmacy, for passing the bills on forged documents to obtain medicines and sold the medicines to co-accused Durlabh at chemist shop in PGI. One Ajay (petitioner), provides data of patients to co-accused Durlabh, who gave 15% commission to Rahul and Balram. Thereafter, Durlabh and Ajay @ Gopal were arrested on 08.03.2025, while co-accused Rahul, Sunil Kumar were arrested on 10.03.2025. On 12.03.2025, co-accused Kapil Kaundal was also arrested.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the allegation against the petitioner is that he procured the data of the patients of Himcare Scheme and Ayushman Bharat, which was further provided to co-accused Durlabh, who used to write fake treatment on the forged cards and get the same cleared from the pharmacy through co-accused Balram, Raman and Rahul. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner has not been named in the FIR and nothing has been recovered from his possession. His name has cropped up in the disclosure statement of co-accused Balram, which is not admissible in

evidence. Petitioner is in custody since 08.03.2025. Challan has already been presented. All the offences are Magisterial trial and the trial will take sufficiently long time to conclude and he may thus be released on regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the bail and argued that in view of the gravity of the offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. Name of the petitioner has cropped up in the disclosure statement of co-accused. As to how much evidentiary value will be attached to the same shall be seen during the trial. Investigation has already been completed and the role of the petitioner is that he had supplied the data of the patients to co-accused Durlabh and he allegedly got 15% commission. Co-accused namely Durlabh, Rahul Kumar, Kapil Kaundal have already been released on bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Case of the petitioner is rather on better footing and since challan has already been presented and trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude, no useful purpose will thus be served by detaining the petitioner in custody and he deserves to be released on bail.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

10.11.2025
amandeep

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No