



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

232+111

CRM-M-63867-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 17.12.2025

Vikas Sharma . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH
PRESENT: None.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

On a call given by the High Court Bar Association, vide resolution dated 15.12.2025, lawyers are observing strike today also, and not appearing in the Court(s).

CRM-51132-2025

- I. This is an application filed u/s 528 of BNSS, 2023, for placing on record the copy of order dated 12.12.2025, passed by this Court in CRM-M-63870-2025, as Annexure P-15.
- II. Allowed as prayed for. Copy of order dated 12.12.2025 filed along with application as Annexure P-15 is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.
- III. CRM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-63867-2025

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of	FIR	Date	Section(s)	Police	District
---------	-----	------	------------	--------	----------



Petitioner(s)	No.			Station	
Vikas Sharma	818	12.12.2024	318(4), 336(3), 338, 340 of BNS, 2023	City Sirsa	Sirsa

2. Considering the fact that the co-accused, namely, Sita Ram Bola, has already been extended the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 08.10.2025 (Annexure P-2), this Court proceeds to examine the facts of the present case, which are already available on record, and to decide the issue involved therein.

3. The impugned FIR was registered on the basis of secret information alleging that one *Shree Sai Institution, Dwarka Puri, Sirsa*, was being run by its Director, namely, Sita Ram Bola, who was allegedly indulging in the preparation and sale of fake certificates in the name of various universities. As per the prosecution case, a raid was conducted, during which certain documents, stamps, and blank papers, allegedly used for preparing fake DMCs, were recovered, leading to registration of the present criminal case.

As per the contentions raised in the present petition, the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor was there any direct evidence available against him. He has been implicated in the present case solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of the main accused/co-accused, namely, Sita Ram Bola, who has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 08.10.2025 (Annexure P-2), passed in CRM-M-34879-2025 titled “*Sita Ram Bola v. State of Haryana*”.

4. Through the instant regular bail petition, the petitioner has sought to explain that he is the General Secretary of Rural Open School, New Delhi, and has been continuing to issue certificates even after the



alleged cancellation of affiliation. It is further contended that the institution in question is registered under the Societies Act and is recognized by the Chhattisgarh State Open School, Raipur. Copies of the registration and recognition certificates have been appended with the present petition. It is also asserted that several other universities and educational institutions have granted recognition to the petitioner's institution for admission purposes. Therefore, according to the petitioner, no offence, as alleged in the FIR, is made out against him.

This Court has also perused its earlier order passed in the anticipatory bail petition, i.e., CRM-M-34879-2025, wherein the contentions raised on behalf of the main accused/co-accused, Sita Ram Bola, were recorded in detail by the Coordinate Bench. The relevant part of which is reproduced here-under:-

“ Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the case of the prosecution is based upon the documentary evidence. He refers to Annexures P-5 and P-6 and submits that upon verification, all the Detailed Mark Sheets and certificates were found to be genuine and the petitioner is running a duly recognized educational institute. The complainant got FIR (supra) registered, as he has not paid the entire fee for his course and the petitioner has been nominated as accused out of personal vendetta and private spite to wreak vengeance. Although the petitioner is involved in one more FIR, however, he has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 07.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-11929-2025 (Annexure P-7).

Notice of motion for 11.08.2025.

*Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137; Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565, Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State of NCT Delhi 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833**, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer within*



a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner will be admitted to interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973).

If the Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, he would appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

*In view of the ratio of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Prabhakar Tiwari Vs. State of UP and anr., 2020(1) RCR (Criminal) 831 and Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and others, 2012(2) SCC 382**, the involvement of an accused in other criminal cases cannot be the sole ground to deny him the concession of bail.*

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law."

Subsequently, upon joining the investigation, the interim anticipatory bail granted to the co-accused was made absolute vide order dated 08.10.2025 (Annexure P-2).

5. In view of the fact that one of the prime co-accused has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail, present petitioner, who is in custody since August 2025, in the opinion of this Court, cannot be kept behind bars for an indefinite period. Moreover, most of the offences alleged are triable by the Court of the learned Magistrate and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. Thus, further custody of the petitioner for any longer, does not appear to be necessary for any meaningful purpose.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing



bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

December 17, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No