



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

207

**CRM-M-29303-2026
Date of decision: 27.05.2026**

SARABJIT SINGH ALIAS SHIBHUPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Birinder Singh Khekhar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 30 dated 17.03.2025, registered under Section(s) 318(4), 319(2), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Civil Lines, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar.

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered pursuant to directions issued by Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, during the pendency of proceedings arising out of FIR No.117 of 2024 registered at Police Station Kamboj, Amritsar. It is the case of the prosecution that one Milkha Singh son of Darshan Singh appeared before the Court in compliance

of notice issued to him in his capacity as a surety. Upon appearance, the said Milkha Singh moved an application before the Court asserting that he had never furnished any surety bonds in the said case. The Court thereafter got the Aadhaar card of Milkha Singh verified through the M-Aadhaar application whereupon it surfaced that the surety bonds, affidavit and photocopy of the Aadhaar card placed on record did not bear the signatures of the real Milkha Singh. It further emerged that even the Aadhaar card annexed with the surety documents did not pertain to the said Milkha Singh and was of some other person. A separate statement of Milkha Singh was thereafter recorded before the Court and he was identified by his counsel Sh. Manjit Singh Bhatti. Upon consideration of the aforesaid circumstances, the Additional Sessions Judge prima facie formed an opinion that some unknown person had impersonated Milkha Singh and had furnished forged and fabricated surety bonds before the Court by using false identification documents, including a fake Aadhaar card, for the purpose of securing bail. The Court further observed that the matter required thorough investigation for tracing the impersonator, the person who identified him and all other persons involved in the commission of the offence. Consequently, the matter was directed to be informed to SHO, Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar, for registration of a criminal case and investigation in accordance with law. The Court also directed that accused Rajeev @ Vadda be taken into custody on account of furnishing of false surety bonds.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner was taken into custody on 10.10.2025 and that the final

report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was filed on 16.10.2025. It is contended that the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody of more than 07 months in the present case and that all the offences alleged are triable by the Court of Magistrate and despite the challan having been presented as far back as October, 2025 and lapse of nearly seven months thereafter, even the charges are yet to be framed by the Trial Court. It is also pointed out that there are 19 witnesses cited by the prosecution and none has been examined so far, thus, the conclusion of trial is likely to take long.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand contends that there are serious allegations against the petitioner regarding his involvement in the preparation and furnishing of forged and fabricated surety documents before the Court and also participating in facilitating fake sureties. He, however, does not dispute that the offences alleged in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate and that the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 07 months and the trial is yet to commence.

5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the present case and taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial and the fact that the offences alleged in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MAY 27, 2026

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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