



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

**CRM-M-11974-2026
Date of decision: 06.04.2026**

KULJEET SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

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

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.15 dated 21.01.2026 registered under Section 316(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 306, 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 317(2) of BNS added later on at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Ludhiana.

2. Brief stated, complainant, namely, Vishal Kumar alleged that his father started a hosiery manufacturing unit in the year 2017 in the name of BHAGSONS (Warmline), where co-accused Ravinder Kumar was working, and was petitioner's colleague. When he left the job, he returned the mobile phone earlier given to him. From the checking of that phone, the complainant came to know that while working at their manufacturing unit, Ravinder Kumar forged company documents, including fake salary slips, used fabricated signatures and stamps of Gurucharan Singh (complainant's father and owner



of business) and suspected account hacking. It was further alleged that Ravinder Kumar, in conspiracy with Kuljit Singh (petitioner herein), used these forged documents for fraudulent activities, including attempts to obtain loans. The accused also misused company letter-heads and involved other workers in altering forged signatures. Hence, the FIR was registered. As per the FIR, some of the forged salary slips were issued in favour of wife of petitioner, and on the basis of such forged slips, petitioner obtained a loan.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the only allegation against the petitioner is that salary slip in the name of his wife was found from the mobile phone returned by co-accused, Ravinder Kumar; it is denied that petitioner availed any loan on the basis of alleged forged salary slips; petitioner is in custody for the last more than 03 months; he is not required for any investigation or recovery purpose and has already been remanded to judicial custody; the petitioner is having clear and clean antecedents and he is not involved in any other case; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars. As such, learned counsel prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner and opposed the contentions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that investigation is going on and the allegation against the petitioner is that a forged slip has been created by him with the help of co-accused, Ravinder Kumar to obtain loan from the bank. Hence, learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Heard.



6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties that the petitioner was remanded to judicial custody and has been in custody for the last more than 03 months; the offences are triable by Magistrate; the petitioner is not involved in any other case and is having clean and clear antecedents; the trial of the case will take sufficient time to conclude, this Court finds merit in the present petition as no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability of accused is to be decided after appreciating evidence adduced by both the parties and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

April 06, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No