



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-56318 of 2025

Date of Decision: 25.02.2026

Harpreet Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Puneet Bhushan and Ms. Krishma Kapoor, Advocates
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for bail is first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 87 dated 24.04.2021, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 177 and 120-B of 'the Indian Penal Code, 1860' Police Station Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being in the backdrop of following facts. A trial was pending in the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib, arising out of FIR No. 58 dated 04.06.2018, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 21 and 29 of 'the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985', Police Station Amloh, District Fatehgarh Sahib. In the above-mentioned case, accused 'Ibuka alias Prince',

a citizen of Nigeria, was released on bail in compliance with the order passed by this court. However, subsequently, during verification of surety it was found that surety 'Charanjit Kaur' had never appeared as a surety before the court and somebody had impersonated her and filed surety bonds before the court. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above-mentioned disclosure the FIR pertaining to the present case was lodged and the investigation taken up. According to prosecution, during the course of investigation, it was found that the petitioner had impersonated 'Phuman Singh' and projected himself as identifier.

3. Heard.

4. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent who has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that he has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than eight months. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that there is no reliable evidence against the petitioner and his detention behind the bars is not likely to serve any purpose.

5. *Per contra*, the learned State counsel has contended that allegations against the petitioner are for the commission of a very serious offence, as it was the role of petitioner only which was responsible for the fraud played with the court and an impersonator could be used for the release of a foreign national on bail. Because of above-mentioned misdeed of the petitioner and his co-accused the main accused is presently absconding.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. A careful perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are necessary to be taken into consideration for a decision:-

- i) *firstly*, the allegations against the petitioner are that he appeared in the court as impersonator and identified a wrong person which resulted into acceptance of bail bonds on the basis of fake documents;
- ii) *secondly*, the gravity of offence of the petitioner can be adjudged from the fact that the petitioner had cheated the entire judicial system and lead to a situation that a foreign national involved in a serious crime like trading of drug, has been released from custody without any check;
- iii) *thirdly*, the custody period of petitioner is not large enough which may lead to a conclusion that his right of speedy trial is being infringed; and
- iv) *fourthly*, there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner with regard to his involvement into the commission of crime.

8. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of above-mentioned factors, coupled with the gravity of offence, it is hereby held that at this stage the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition being devoid of merits deserves dismissal. Hence, the present petition is hereby **dismissed**, accordingly.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

February 25, 2026

“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No