

CRM-M-18004-2026

2026.PHHC:061436



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-18004-2026
Date of decision: 22.05.2026

RAJBIR SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Kushager Goyal, 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.154 dated 10.02.2023 under Sections 199, 200, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Civil Line Sirsa, District Sirsa, Haryana.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner in order to secure release of one Raju Mandal on bail, forged and fabricated surety bonds before the trial Court wherein one co-accused Hansraj impersonated himself as Tara Chand and another co-accused Bhajan identified him as Tara Chand. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR, nor has any concern with the said offence. It has also been contended that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused only on the basis of the disclosure



statement made by the co-accused. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioners with the offence in question and it is a trite law that disclosure statement of the co-accused during his custodial interrogation is not admissible. He further submitted that the petitioner is not the beneficiary of the alleged offence. Further, co-accused persons already been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned trial Court as well as by this Court, vide orders dated 24.06.2025 and 05.03.2026 respectively. The petitioner is in custody since 24.05.2025. The investigation in this case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits that there are total 08 prosecution witnesses but none have been examined till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind 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 of the petitioner, which is taken on record. Status report has already been filed and she relying upon the same has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. She argued that the petitioner is specifically named in the disclosure statement of co-accused and he has actively participated in the crime. She further submits that the petitioner is involved in multiple other FIRs, meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

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 11 months; investigation is complete; challan stands



presented; charges framed; no prosecution witness has been examined; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial; the trial is proceeding at snail's pace, and will take a long time to conclude. Thus, 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. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of *Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131*, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of her 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. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*; in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged

CRM-M-18004-2026

2026.PHHC:061436



and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

8. 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.

22.05.2026

Mohit Bishnoi

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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