



CRM-M-46042-2025 (O&M)

1

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

212

CRM-M-46042-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 04.02.2026

Akash

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Nitin Nandal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asst. A.G. Haryana.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (oral)

This is first petition for bail filed by the petitioner with regard to FIR No.78 dated 20.02.2025 under Sections 181 and 238(b) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station City, District Rohtak. The abovementioned FIR came into being at the instance of 'Abhinav Seth, Intelligence Officer', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was reported by the above-named complainant to SHO, Police Station Rohtak that he was investigating a case pertaining to import of plain papers with security thread, having RBI and Bharat printed thereupon. As per above-named complainant, during the course of investigation it was found that 17 consignments of such papers were received, which were in violation of import policy of India and prohibited under the abovementioned policy. According to complainant, the abovesaid papers were used for printing of

**CRM-M-46042-2025 (O&M)**

2

fake currency notes and that one of such consignments was received by the petitioner.

2. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned information, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

3. The learned State Counsel has already filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent, who has been falsely implicated in the present case, merely on the suspicion that he had received a consignment of papers by placing an online order. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, firstly any such consignment has not been received by the petitioner, and secondly, the purchase of abovementioned paper is not illegal and therefore, the same does not amount to commission of any offence. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 11 months, and that he has clean antecedents.

6. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that nothing objectionable has been recovered from the possession of petitioner, and that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, as out of 13 prosecution witnesses, only 3 have been examined so far. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, in the given fact situation the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

**CRM-M-46042-2025 (O&M)**

3

7. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel, in the present case there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner with regard to printing of fake currency notes. As per learned State Counsel, the involvement of petitioner in the commission of crime stands proved from the fact that he had used his mobile phone for placing order (online) for the purchase of paper and the courier boy, who delivered the abovementioned consignment to the petitioner, has duly identified him as recipient of the same.

8. According to learned State Counsel, the paper of restricted category bearing security thread and printed RBI/Bharat thereupon, has been used for printing of fake currency notes, and that the petitioner has failed to explain for what purposes such type of paper was purchased by him. As per learned State Counsel, the printer has also been recovered from the possession of petitioner, which was capable of printing the fake currency notes. While claiming that the act, wherein the petitioner was involved, has a very negative impact on the economy of the country, the learned State Counsel has contended that act of the petitioner does not come within the ambit of ordinary crime, and therefore, it has to be dealt with iron hands.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration, for arriving at any decision: -

- i) that in the present case, the total custody period of petitioner is not even one year, and therefore, by any standard it cannot be



CRM-M-46042-2025 (O&M)

4

observed that there is delay in trial, or that the petitioner has been subjected to the prolonged incarceration;

- ii) that the allegations against the petitioner are quite specific and prima facie there is supportive evidence to prove the abovementioned allegations;
- iii) that the trial is taking place at a reasonable pace, as out of 13 prosecution witnesses, 03 have already been examined;
- iv) that all the material witnesses are yet to be examined in this case; and
- v) that the offence committed by the petitioner is of grievous nature, which can have a very negative impact on the economy of the country.

11. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration it leads to the conclusion that at this stage, when the material witnesses are yet to be examined, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail, and that the present petition being devoid of merit deserves dismissal.

12. Accordingly, the present petition is hereby ***dismissed***. However it is clarified that the abovementioned observations shall not have any bearing upon the merits of the case.

13. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

04.02.2026

Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No