



CRM-M-67300-2025

-1-

(128)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-67300-2025

Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

KULWINDER SINGH ALIAS ROHIT

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CRM-M-69519-2025

VIKRAM KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CRM-M-71225-2025

LOVEPREET SINGH ALIAS LAVI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CRM-M-71584-2025

RENU KANT

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CRM-M-71645-2025

HAKAM SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

**CRM-M-67300-2025**

-2-

STATE OF PUNJAB**...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present: Ms. Sakshi Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-67300-2025.

Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate with
Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate
in CRM-M-69519-2025, CRM-M-71225-2025,
CRM-M-71584-2025 and CRM-M-41645-2025
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

This order shall dispose of five petitions bearing No.CRM-M-67300-2025 titled as Kulwinder Singh alias Rohit Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-69519-2025 titled as Vikram Kumar Versus State of Punjab, CRM-M-71225-2025 titled as Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi, CRM-M-71584-2025 titled as Renu Kant Versus State of Punjab and CRM-M-71645-2025 titled as Hakam Singh Versus State of Punjab as the same are arising out of the same FIR. However, for the sake of convenience the facts have been taken from CRM-M-67300-2025.

2. The prayer in the present petitions under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.77 dated 19.06.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 111 and 61(2) BNS at Police Station Division No.4, Patiala.

3. The learned counsels for the petitioners contend that the allegations against the petitioners are that they were involved in furnishing fake surety and forgery of documents is baseless. As the petitioners are in



CRM-M-67300-2025

-3-

custody since 20.06.2025, 01.09.2025 and 19.06.2025 respectively but none of the 31 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, they are entitled to the concession of bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel contends that the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioners do not entitle them to the concession of bail. He, however, concedes that the petitioners are in custody since 20.06.2025, 01.09.2025 and 19.06.2025 respectively but none of the 31 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. This Court in the case titled as ***Maninder Sharma Vs. State Tax Officer, State, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab bearing CRM-M24033-2021(O&M) Decided on 31.08.2022*** has held as under:-

“Therefore, broadly speaking (subject to any statutory restrictions contained in Special Acts) , in economic offences involving the IPC or Special Acts or cases triable by Magistrates once the investigation is complete, final report/complaint filed and the triple test is satisfied then denial of bail must be the exception rather than the rule. However, this would not prevent the Court from granting bail even prior to the completion of investigation if the facts so warrant.”

7. In the instant case, admittedly, the petitioners are in custody since 20.06.2025, 01.09.2025 and 19.06.2025 respectively but none of the 31 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. There are no serious apprehensions expressed by the State that the petitioners would abscond from justice, tamper with the evidence or influence witnesses if granted the

**CRM-M-67300-2025**

-4-

concession of bail. Therefore, in this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioners is not required.

8. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. The petitioners shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that they are not involved in any other crime other than the present case.

10. The petitioners (or anyone on their behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- each and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioners from trial without sufficient cause

11. The petitions stand disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

10.03.2026

JITESH

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No**Whether reportable:- Yes/No**