



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

217

CRM-M-12534-2026

Date of decision: 13.03.2026

SANDEEP

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sunil Saharan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.143 dated 12.05.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 61 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, Police Station Civil Lines, District Hisar.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being in response to an order passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar. The background of the above-mentioned case was a complaint filed by two complainants, namely Sanjay Kumar and Pardeep Kumar. Vide above-mentioned complaint, it was alleged, by the above-named two complainants, that on 17.12.2024 the petition for bail moved by one accused Lovepreet @ Labu @ Lapreet Singh was allowed by the Court and for



his release, bail bonds were furnished by two unknown persons, who impersonated themselves as Sanjay Kumar and Pardeep Kumar. While alleging that on the basis of forged documents, the bail bonds had been furnished, a request for action against the culprits was prayed for by the above-named complainants. The record shows that pursuant to above-mentioned complaint, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar recorded an order with a direction to the police to register the case.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to above-mentioned complaint formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution, during the course of investigation it transpired that the petitioner Sandeep had impersonated himself as Sanjay Kumar and furnished the bail bonds.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State. Hence, the service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with. The learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate. The same be taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than eight months, and that he has clean antecedents. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent, having no nexus, whatsoever with the commission of crime. According to learned counsel for the petitioner on the parity also, the petitioner



is entitled for the benefit of bail as the co-accused Lovepreet @ Labu @ Lapreet Singh has already been accorded the same benefit, vide order dated 11.02.2026 in CRM-M-46107-2025.

8. The above-mentioned arguments have been controverted by learned State counsel. It has been contended by learned State counsel that the petitioner was the person, who had impersonated himself as Sanjay Kumar ,and therefore, the role attributed to the petitioner is altogether different from the role attributed to Lovepreet @ Labu @ Lapreet Singh. According to learned State counsel a very serious nature of offence has been committed by the petitioner, who has tried to cheat the Court itself. In view of above contentions, the learned State counsel has claimed that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of record shows that the petitioner is being prosecuted for the commission of offence for which the punishment prescribed is imprisonment for life.

11. In addition to above, it is also relevant to mention here that the act of the petitioner was such, which violated the very sanctity of the Court processes, as by impersonating himself as Sanjay Kumar, he got an accused released on bail. As far as the claim for parity is concerned since the role attributed to the petitioner is altogether different from the role attributed to his co-accused, it is hereby observed that the petitioner on the ground of parity is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

12. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above-discussed factors, and the mitigating circumstances, it is hereby observed that



in view of nature of offence committed by the petitioner, its gravity and other circumstances, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition being devoid of merits, deserves dismissal. Hence, the same is hereby **dismissed** accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

13.03.2026
vipin

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