



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

222

CRM-M-19717-2026
Decided on :30.04.2026

YOGRAJ

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Partap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.265 dated 14.05.2025, under Sections 316(5), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 61 of BNS (section 238 of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Assandh, District Karnal.

2. As per the allegations, co-accused Pawan Kumar was elected as Sarpanch of Village Mundh, District Karnal, for the period 2021 onwards. FIR alleges that upon reviewing the records presented by him, it was found that the records did not pertain to the tenure of the ex-Sarpanch for 2016-21 but of former Sarpanch for the period 2011–2016.

Under Section 18 of the Haryana Panchayati Raj Act, he was directed to supply the records for the period 2016–2021. However, it is



alleged that Pawan Kumar destroyed the complete records pertaining to that period. It is noted that Ms. Veena Devi was functioning as Sarpanch of the village during 2016–2021. The records demanded by the department included:

- i) Proceedings of all schemes, Panchayat fund, PRI, HRDF, MNREGA;*
- ii) Cashbooks of all schemes;*
- iii) Voucher files of all schemes;*
- iv) Stock registers of all schemes;*
- v) MBs of all schemes;*
- vi) Muster rolls of all schemes;*
- vii) Lease registers;*
- viii) Bank passbooks and receipt books;*
- ix) House tax register and its receipt book, etc.*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that allegations levelled against the petitioner are false and misconceived. It is contended that role attributed to the petitioner is that, being a private individual and brother-in-law of the former Sarpanch-Veena Devi, he allegedly visited the house of the sitting Sarpanch-Pawan Kumar, to examine the official Gram Panchayat records and, upon purportedly discovering irregularities pertaining to the tenure of his sister-in-law, is stated to have prepared certain false and forged documents and handed them over to the present Sarpanch-Pawan Kumar.

Counsel for the petitioner argues that responsibility for maintaining and preserving the official records of the village rested solely with the Gram Sachiv. It is argued that no steps were taken by the concerned authorities for requisition or verification of the records during the tenure of Smt. Veena Devi, which suggests either



negligence on the part of the officials or their connivance with the then Sarpanch or the Panchayat Secretary.

4. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is in custody since 25.12.2025, and any further incarceration would not serve any meaningful purpose. Petitioner has been arrayed as an accused in the present case, solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Pawan Kumar, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 07.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-68738-2025 (Annexure P-2).

It is further submitted that, as per the contents of the disclosure statement of co-accused Pawan Kumar, allegations have been levelled to the effect that petitioner had made interpolations/alterations in the Panchayat records. However, there is no substantive material on record to support the said allegation. On the contrary, the relevant records pertain to the year 2021, whereas FIR in the present case came to be registered in the year 2025, at which point, the records were already in the custody of the present Sarpanch.

Moreover, investigation has already been completed, and final report has been submitted on 14.11.2025. Since the charges are yet to be framed, the trial is likely to take considerable time, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail and submits that petitioner is facing serious allegations.



Learned State counsel further submits that FSL report with respect to the handwriting specimen obtained from the petitioner, is still awaited. It is additionally contended that official records of the village have been destroyed, and therefore, no leniency ought to be shown while considering the petitioner's prayer for grant of bail.

6. I have heard Learned Counsel for the parties and perused the paper book and the documents appended thereto.

7. Considering that the offences alleged are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, and petitioner is in custody since 25.12.2025, trial is yet to commence, and co-accused Pawan Kumar has already been extended the concession of regular bail, this Court finds that further detention of the petitioner would serve no meaningful purpose.

8. In view of the above facts and circumstances, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court does not find any justification to continue the detention of the petitioner in custody.

Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an



independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

30.04.2026
Lavisha

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*