



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

CRM-M-31052-2026

Date of Decision: 01.07.2026

Ajay @ Ajay Kumar

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Parmod Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.0112 dated 10.06.2025 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC (Corresponding Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) of BNS, 2023) and Section 201 of IPC (Corresponding Section 238 of BNS, 2023) added during investigation, at Police Station Dadri City, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the allegations levelled by the complainant, the petitioner had obtained a job of Lab Technician (NHM) on the basis of forged and fabricated certificates. He further submits that in fact, the petitioner has studied in an institute as a bonafide student and he was informed by his co-accused that the institute/Study Centre was approved by the concerned University as well as the University Grants Commission. He further contends that now after completion of investigation in the present case, challan has already been presented against the present petitioner. Even during investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 03.04.2026

and is in custody for the last about three months. He further contends that in fact, the petitioner himself is a victim in the present case and has been wrongly arrayed as an accused in the present case. Apart from that, the prosecution has relied upon 11 witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. This clearly proves that the prosecution has intentionally delayed the disposal of the trial before the trial Court.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, undoubtedly, the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. However, this Court cannot overlook the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last about three months and all the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate. Even otherwise, the prosecution has cited 11 witnesses and has not been able to examine even a single witness so far. Thus, the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time and further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

01.07.2026
hemlata

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