



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

Sr.No.241

**CRM-M-15503-2026
Decided on : 18.05.2026**

Mohan Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Sarvesh Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.371 dated 30.11.2023, registered under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 34 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Rai, District Sonapat.
2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that, the petitioner along with co-accused got executed a forged sale deed in the name of Smt. Shanti Devi by producing one Chandu in place of Murta Ram and himself impersonating as Parlo Ram, who were the real owners of the land. Hence the present FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with



the said offence. He further contends that the present FIR emanates out of civil dispute between the parties and the name of the petitioner has been dragged up unnecessarily. Learned counsel contends that the complainant has not suffered any loss as he has no concern with property in question as he is neither the owner of the property nor he is having any right over the property. He further contends that the petitioner is neither the signatory nor witness to the said sale deed. Learned counsel contends that the present case is based on documentary evidence and all the documents are already in possession of the investigating agency and nothing is to be recovered from the present petitioner. It has been submitted that co-accused Naresh and Satpal have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 21.01.2026 (Annexures P-3 and P-4). The petitioner is in custody since 18.09.2025. Learned counsel contends that the complainant has not suffered any loss as he has no link with the property in question. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges are yet to be framed. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. He further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate which is taken on record. The status report has already been filed. She, while referring to the said status report, has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. She has further submitted that the petitioner actively assisted in execution of fraudulent sale deed and collaborated with other co-



accused persons involved in impersonation and registration of forged documents. However, she has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is a first time offenders as he is not involved in any other case.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 07 months and 28 days; co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court; the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case; the investigation in this case is complete; challan stands presented, charges are yet to be framed and the fact that trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. This Court is sanguine of the fact that according to the proposition settled by the Apex Court in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle “bail is a rule” and “jail is an exception”.

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.



CRM-M-15503-2026 4

8. All miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

18.05.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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