

CRM-M-10648-2026 (O & M) 2026:PHHC:080436



::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(216)

CRM-M-10648-2026 (O & M)
Date of decision:21.05.2026

Sushil Kumar @ Sushil Kumar Singh

..... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate,
with Mr. Ankit Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Geeta Rani, AAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.332 dated 09.10.2025 under Sections 212(a), 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala.

2. As per the allegations levelled, the petitioner arranged fake surety and produced fake surety and identifier, through, co-accused Heena and the petitioner paid Rs.15,000/- through Paytm to co-accused Heena on 09.10.2025 i.e. the date on which the fake surety and identifier had been produced before the Court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Taking the allegations to be correct, the offence is triable by the Court of a Magistrate.

As the petitioner is in custody since 17.11.2025 but only 01 of the 10



::2::

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.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, while referring to the status report dated 16.04.2026 which is on record, contends that the allegations against the petitioner are grave inasmuch as he has hoodwinked the Court. Therefore, he is not entitled to the concession as prayed for. She, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 17.11.2025, that only 01 of the 10 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and that the case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate.

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

6. This Court in the case titled as ***Maninder Sharma Vs. State Tax Officer, State, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab bearing CRM-M24033-2021(O&M) Decided on 31.08.2022*** has held as under:-

“Therefore, broadly speaking (subject to any statutory restrictions contained in Special Acts) , in economic offences involving the IPC or Special Acts or cases triable by Magistrates once the investigation is complete, final report/complaint filed and the triple test is satisfied then denial of bail must be the exception rather than the rule. However, this would not prevent the Court from granting bail even prior to the completion of investigation if the facts so warrant.”

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 17.11.2025 but only 01 of the 10 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in



::3::

the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. The present case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate and no serious apprehension has been expressed by the State that the petitioner would abscond from justice, tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses if granted the concession of bail. Therefore, in this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

8. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Sushil Kumar @ Sushil Kumar Singh is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other case/crime other than the present one.

10. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- 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 present petition stands disposed of.

12. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

May 21, 2026
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No