



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34189-2026

Date of decision : 24.06.2026

Baldev Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Anuj Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG, Haryana

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 / Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.103 dated 04.05.2023 registered under Sections 406, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC (now Sections 316(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 319(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023) at Police Station City Pehowa, District Kurukshetra.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.01.2026 and the investigation in the present case is complete and the challan/supplementary challan has been presented. It is submitted that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and the



petitioner was not named in the present FIR and it is only subsequently that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that Sanjeev Kumar and Krishna Kumar have been specifically named in the FIR and it has been alleged in the FIR that the mother of Krishna Kumar, i.e. Shimla Devi, had agreed to sell their land for Rs.43,00,000/-. It is submitted that the petitioner was not beneficiary of the said transaction and, as per the prosecution case, it is alleged against the petitioner that the petitioner had identified the said Shimla Devi, who was the mother of Krishna Kumar and who has been alleged to be the impersonator by one Maya Devi. It is submitted that the co-accused Sanjeev Kumar who has been named in the FIR has been granted regular bail vide order dated 25.07.2024 passed in CRM-M-21781-2024 passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and even Rajesh Kumar has been granted regular bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this court vide order dated 14.10.2024. It is further submitted that entire case is based on documents and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further incarceration.

3. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the present petition for regular bail and has submitted that in the present case, the petitioner had also wrongly identified Maya Devi as Shimla Devi and had thus helped the said Maya Devi to impersonate Shimla Devi.

4. Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, moreso, the fact that the petitioner has been in custody since 20.01.2026 and the investigation is complete and the challan has been presented and also



the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and one of the co-accused Sanjeev Kumar, who has specifically been named in the FIR, has been granted benefit of regular bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 25.07.2024 passed in CRM-M-21781-2024 (Annexure P-3) and also the fact that the petitioner was not beneficiary to the agreement to sell, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate, subject to him not being required in any other case.

5. However, it is made clear that in case, any act is done by the petitioner to threaten or influence the complainant or any of the witnesses, then it would be open to the State to move an application for cancellation of bail granted to the petitioner.

6. Nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the observations made in the present case which are only for the purpose of adjudicating the present bail petition.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

June 24, 2026.
Davinder Kumar

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