



CRM-M-4921-2026 (O & M)

::1::

(217)

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

CRM-M-4921-2026 (O & M)

Date of Decision: 24.02.2026

Lakhan Pal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Navmohit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

The prayer in the present petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. (Section 483 BNSS) is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.584 dated 27.12.2024 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120B IPC and Section 8 of the P.C. Act registered at Police Station Dabua, District Faridabad.

2. The brief facts leading to the registration of the FIR aforementioned are that a complaint was received from the Praveen Kumar, Branch Manager, SBI, Sector 11, Mathura Road, Faridabad, wherein it was averred that while enclosing a list of 42 cases, wherein FIR was required to be registered against the defaulting borrowers for cheating the Bank by securing Xpress Credit Loans from their Branch, Sainik Colony, Sector 49, Faridabad, on the basis of forged documents for misappropriation of public

**CRM-M-4921-2026 (O & M)**

::2::

funds and criminal breach of trust by the borrowers. Legal action was sought. On the basis of the complaint, a preliminary enquiry was conducted. Statements of Vishal, Meenu Jha, were recorded. As per the statement of Vishal son of Ashok Kumar, who was one of the borrowers, he was a Munshi in a Private Company and his loan to the tune of Rs.15,48,300/- had been got passed by Loan Agent Sarabjeet, who had obtained his signatures on certain documents. While identifying his signatures on the documents, it was stated that those were got prepared by Sarabjeet, by giving assurance that maximum amount of loan could be availed with the help of those documents provided he (ie. Sarabjeet) was given commission of 20% of the loan amount. Vishal disclosed that he was in need of money. and he had availed the loan and had given commission of 20%, to Sarabjeet. Similar was the statement of the another borrower, namely Meenu Jha, wife of Suman Kumar Jha, who was also in need of money and one Bhupender had fixed her meeting with one Rajeev Kumar Sharma, who had assured to get her the loan availed, despite the fact that she was not in any job by saying that he would prepare all the documents on his own, who had prepared the same, by taking her signatures, thereupon. She further disclosed that she was given loan of Rs. 1 lac only. However, when she received a notice from the concerned Bank, she came to know that on the basis of her signatures appended on the documents prepared by Rajeev Kumar Sharma, she had been issued a loan to the tune of Rs. 15,60,000/-. Similarly, other persons/borrowers of loan were issued notices but did not join or provide any documents.

**CRM-M-4921-2026 (O & M)**

::3::

3. Pursuant to the aforementioned complaint, an enquiry took place leading to the registration of the FIR in question. Thereafter, various persons including the present petitioner were nominated as accused. As per the allegations levelled against the petitioner, he was well-known to the Branch Manager of State Bank of India, namely, Rajiv Ranjan through whom he obtained loans on forged and fictitious documents for different persons and earned commission for the same.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. A co-accused, namely, Kamlesh Mishra @ Bittan has been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 27.01.2026. As the petitioner is in custody since 08.10.2025 but none of the 34 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

5. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner is one of the persons who acted like middle men providing loans from the bank to various persons on forged documents. For the said loans, he earned commission. The allegations levelled against the petitioner do not entitle him to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 08.10.2025, that none of the 34 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and that a co-accused/Kamlesh Mishra has been granted the concession of bail.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.



CRM-M-4921-2026 (O & M)

::4::

7. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 08.10.2025 but none of the 34 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. A co-accused/Kamlesh Mishra has been granted the concession of bail. In this situation, he can be granted the said concession as well.

8. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Lakhan Pal is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. The petitioner shall appear on the first Monday of every month before the local police station till the conclusion of the trial and furnish an affidavit each time that he is not involved in any crime other than the present one.

10. In addition, the petitioner (or anybody on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from Trial without sufficient cause.

11. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

February 24, 2026

sukhpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable :- Yes/No