

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

2026:PHHC:048337



126

CRM-M-14344-2026
Date of decision: 27.03.2026
Date of uploading: 27.03.2026

Harmandeep Singh

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Damanjit Singh Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.106 Dated 07.07.2025 Under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, (Corresponding to Section 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023) registered at Police Station Sadar Nawanshahr, District SBS Nagar.
2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out by the petitioner in the present petition) is as follows:-

“Letter number 20/DSJ-15 Dated 04-01-2025 from the court of Mrs. Priya Sood DSJ/SBSN Sahib was received in the police station stating that in FIR No. 62 dated 20-04-2024 u/s 379-B, 411 IPC Police Station City Nawanshahr, a fake surety has been furnished in the Honorable Court for accused Tarun Kumar son of Des Raj resident of H. No. 1323/18, Street Number 3, Baba Buddha Ji Nagar, Rama Mandi Jalandhar by Sarwan Singh son of Gurnam Singh resident of Akalgarh, Tehsil Phagwara, District Kapurthala. Which was verified by Namberdar Sukhbir Singh son of Sohan Singh resident of Akalgarh, Tehsil Phagwara, District Kapurthala and Ajit Singh Namberdar. Whereas the real Sarwan Singh son of Gurnam Singh resident of Akalgarh, Tehsil Phagwara, District Kapurthala appeared in the Honorable Court and stated that he has not furnished any surety for anyone. Upon which the order to register a case was received from the Honorable Court. The accused of the FIR No. 62 dated 20-04-2024 u/s 379-B, 411 IPC Police Station City Nawanshahr namely Tarun Kumar son of Des Raj resident of H.No. 1323/18, Street Number 3, Baba Buddha Ji Nagar, Rama Mandi Jalandhar and the unknown persons who furnished and verified his fake surety have committed an offense under sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC by furnishing fake surety. That as per the orders of the Honorable Court, after registering a case under the above-mentioned sections against Tarun Kumar son of Des Raj resident of H. No. 1323/18, Street Number 3, Baba Buddha Ji Nagar, Rama Mandi Jalandhar and the unknown persons who furnished and verified his fake surety, the original order along with related documents and a copy of the FIR are being handed over to ASI Paramjit Singh 122/SBSN for investigation. Information is being given to the higher officers and the control room via wireless.”

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 04.12.2025. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that, upon culmination of investigation, challan stands presented against the petitioner on 27.02.2026,

which is primarily based on documentary evidence. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has further submitted that the trial emanating from the FIR in question is a magisterial one and the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for more than 3 months. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 18.03.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 04.12.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan was presented on 27.02.2026. Total 14 prosecution have been cited and it is the conceded position before this Court that none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined till date. It is not in dispute that conclusion of trial will take long time. It is also not in dispute before this Court that trial emanating from the FIR in question is a Magisterial one. The rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties; as to the whether the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR, shall be gone into during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage lest it may prejudice the rights of either of the parties. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the

petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the remaining prosecution evidence.

7. As per the custody certificate dated 18.03.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for 3 months & 10 days and is not shown to be involved in any other FIR/case.

Suffice to say, the further detention of the petitioner in custody is not required in the facts and circumstances of the case.

8. In view of above, the petition in hand is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

9. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.
10. Ordered accordingly.
11. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
12. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

March 27, 2026
Naveen

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