

CRM-M-60158-2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-60158-2024
Reserved on: 13.01.2025
Pronounced on: 29.01.2025

Ravinder Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Naveen K. Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
217	10.04.2024	Industrial Sector 29, Panipat, District Panipat	279, 337, 338 IPC and 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC added later on

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. In paragraph 20 of the bail petition, the accused declares the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	78	16.03.2022	376, 376(2)(n) IPC	Civil Lines Rohtak, District Rohtak

3. The facts and allegations are taken from the reply dated 10.01.2025 filed by the State, as per which the crime in question came to the surface when an accident took place on 05.04.2024. During the investigation the injured made a statement that a vehicle which was driven in rash and negligent manner, hit him. Based on this, an FIR of rash and negligent driving was registered. The investigation of the said case was started. In the investigation, the complainant informed the investigator that a vehicle EECO bearing registration No.HR10-AB-6598, driven by Pritam Singh, had caused accident. Consequently the notice under Section 133 of Motor Vehicle Accident Act was given to the registered owner of the vehicle, Rahul, who told the police that he had sold the vehicle to another person, also named as Rahul S/o Suresh Kumar. Thereafter, police

CRM-M-60158-2024

issued notice to said Rahul S/o Suresh Kumar, who was interrogated and presented all documents of the vehicle including driving license. Subsequently, he also gave driving license of the driver Pritam. Verification of the driving license showed that it was fake. Consequently, on 19.10.2024, Pritam joined the investigation and during the interrogation, he disclosed that the petitioner had got prepared the forged driving license in lieu of Rs.5,000/-.

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“4. That the name of the petitioner surfaced from the disclosure statement of the co-accused Pritam. The role of the petitioner is that he in conspiracy with the accused Pritam S/o Madan got prepared forged driving license for the accused Pritam and took Rs.5,000/- for this work.”

7. Although the allegations against the petitioner are serious, but the evidence is in the shape of disclosure statement as such on this ground alone this Court is granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.

9. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

10. The investigation indicates that the petitioner is not the main accused, so the petitioner's bail shall not be treated as a precedent for granting bail to the other co-accused with a higher role.

11. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on anticipatory bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a

CRM-M-60158-2024

Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

12. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

13. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

14. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

15. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

16. This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State may file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall be at liberty to cancel this bail.

17. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the

CRM-M-60158-2024

case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

18. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

19. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

29.01.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.