



CRM-M-341-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-341-2025

Reserved on: 28<sup>th</sup> July, 2025Pronounced on: 8<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

Lakhwinder Kumar @ Lucky

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. S.S. Sohi, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 46 dated 02.05.2024 registered under Sections 489-A, 489-B, 489-C, 489-D and 120-B of IPC at Police Station City-I, Malerkotla, District Malerkotla.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of information given by ASI Maghar Singh posted at Police Station City-I, Malerkotla, alleging therein that on the night of 02.05.2024, he received a secret information that the petitioner along with his associates and one Rishu Kumar was engaged in the business of making and supplying fake currency notes and had been supplying the same in the city of Malerkotla and adjoining cities. It was informed that even at that time he was present at Garewal Chowk, Malerkotla and could be apprehended with a huge quantity of fake and counterfeited currency notes, if raided. Believing the secret information to be true, a raiding party was immediately formed. Intimation



was sent to the police station for registration of FIR. The petitioner and co-accused Rishu were apprehended. 570 counterfeit currency notes of Rs. 500/- denomination each were recovered from the petitioner and the co-accused. The same were taken into custody. The petitioner was interrogated and suffered a disclosure statement, admitting his involvement in printing and supplying of counterfeit currency notes along with the co-accused and also disclosed the involvement of some other persons. The co-accused, Amit Gill, was also arrested in pursuance of the disclosure statement of the present petitioner and, as per his identification, 400 counterfeit currency notes of Rs. 500/- denomination were recovered from him. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner, along with the co-accused, is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. A false recovery has been planted upon him. He has been in custody since 02.05.2024. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. No material has been collected to prove that he was involved in any part of the manufacturing process or counterfeiting. He had not even been caught while engaged in selling or supplying counterfeited currency. He did not receive any counterfeited currency. The allegations against him are vague and general. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that the petitioner is a habitual offender. Allegations against him are quite serious in nature. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating



the witnesses or committing similar offences if extended benefit of will.

Therefore, it is urged that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner, along with two co-accused, is alleged to be involved in the business of manufacturing and supplying counterfeited currency notes. Recovery of 570 counterfeited currency notes of Rs. 500/- denomination was effected from him. Similar recovery had been effected from the co-accused Amit. The allegations against the petitioner are quite grave in nature. He is a habitual offender. One more case of similar nature has been registered against him, apart from six other criminal cases. There is nothing on the court to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial. Keeping in view the antecedents of the petitioner, the nature of the subject offences, quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances, but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**8<sup>th</sup> August, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*  
: *Yes / No*