



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

131

CRM-M-49538-2025
DECIDED ON: 11.03.2026

RAMPALPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate
Mr. Ankit Saini, Advocate
Ms. Ruby Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana assisted by
ASI Sanjay.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rampal	188	17.06.2025	318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 61 of the BNS	Hisar Civil Lines	Hisar

2. As per allegations, the petitioner Rampal is 51 years old was convicted in a case under Section 138 Negotiable Instruments Act and on filing appeal before the Appellate Court i.e. Court of Sessions, and after admitting the same, they were ordered to be released on bail on furnishing of surety bonds.

On one date fixed before appellate Court, when petitioner failed to put an appearance, bail was cancelled and notice was issued to the surety and thereupon, it surfaced that the bail bonds etc. furnished by the surety are all fake and same have been furnished by the fake persons after preparing the false documents i.e. Aadhar Card and Identity Card etc.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that apart petitioner Rampal, there are 3 other accused namely Ramesh, Sombir and Advocate Dheeraj Kumar Awasthi.

Co-accused Sombir filed CRM-M-33819-2025 (Annexure P-3), who was granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 03.07.2025 and then the same was confirmed vide order dated 07.08.2025. Another Co-accused Dheeraj Kumar Awasthi filed CRM-M-35633-2025 (Annexure P-4), who was granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 10.07.2025 and then the same was confirmed vide order dated 07.08.2025.

4. From the status report, he further refers the statement of the accused - Sombir wherein it has been mentioned that petitioner-Rampal had only made a request to accused Sombir for making arrangement of the surety for him.

After highlighting the complete circumstances counsel for the petitioner argues that the present case is built up even by the prosecution, and petitioner is not the main accused, rather it is the other co-accused who arranged a fake surety for the petitioner, though, the outcome went in favour of the petitioner, and he succeeded in getting the bail.

5. Petitioner already being inside jail since 16.07.2025 and no useful purpose would be served for keeping the petitioner behind bars for an indefinite

period. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case, as the allegations are needed to be proved that too, through documentary evidence.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that petitioner does not deserve any concession for regular bail for two reasons, mainly, that he is already facing 18 other criminal cases against him, and most of those cases, are falling under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

He further submits that petitioner is the ultimate beneficiary of the submission of fake surety, therefore, present petition be dismissed.

7. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the respective parties and also gone through the record available before it. After noticing the facts that other co-accused namely Ramesh, Sombir and Advocate Dheeraj Kumar Awasthi have already been released on bail, whereas and petitioner is inside jail since 16.07.2025 in the present case and allegations are primarily to be proved through documentary evidence which were submitted while furnishing of bail bonds for releasing the petitioner on bail; I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

8. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial

Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

11.03.2026
mahima

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>