

2026.PHHC.021048



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-46107-2025

Date of decision: 11th February, 2026

Lovepreet @ Labu @ Lapreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Priyanshu Kamra, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through VC)

Ms. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 143 dated 12.05.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340 and 61 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Civil Lines, District Hisar.

2. As per the allegations, the petitioner was arrested and was in custody in connection with a case pending before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar. He was extended benefit of bail in that case on 17.12.2024, subject to furnishing personal as well as surety bonds. On 28.01.2025, surety bonds were furnished before the concerned Court by impersonating some persons and on the basis of fake and fabricated

2026.PHHC.021048



documents, the petitioner secured his release on bail. Even the identifier was an impersonator. On a complaint submitted by two persons namely Sanjay Kumar and Pardeep Kumar, before the concerned Additional Sessions Judge, order was passed by him for registration of FIR and conducting investigation since by misusing the revenue record pertaining to Sanjay Kumar and Pardeep Kumar, some impersonators had appeared in the Court as sureties and were identified by one Sunil Kumar, Panch who was also found to be impersonator. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. As per the further allegations, the petitioner was arrested on 26.06.2025. He suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime with the co-accused Sanjay Jangra, Mukesh and Sandeep in the preparation of false and fabricated documents for furnishing surety bonds on his behalf. Investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since long. He is not required for further incarceration. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. It is, thus, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Status report and custody certificate have been filed by respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender being involved in six more cases. In order to secure his release on bail, he connived with co-accused who prepared false documents of ownership in form of revenue record and who by impersonating other

2026.PHHC.021048



persons stood surety for the petitioner so as to ensure his release committed fraud and cheating with the court of complainant. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused, who impersonated some other persons on the basis of false and fabricated documents and by producing them as his sureties for his release on bail. The allegations make out a *prima facie* case for commission of subject offences against the petitioner. However, he is in custody for over a period of seven months. Trial will take considerable time to conclude since even charges have not been framed so far. The offences for which he has been booked for are triable by Magistrate. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. It is also well settled that pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentence. The object of jail is to secure appearance of the accused during trial, and it cannot be preventive or punitive. Keeping in view the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds with two sureties to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

2026.PHHC.021048



8. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

11th February, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |