

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

132

2026:PHHC:037469



CRM-M-68770-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.03.2026.

INDERJIT SINGH @ BABU

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, (Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.39 dated 20.03.2024, under Section(s) 177, 199, 200, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Division No.5, Police Commissionerate, District Ludhiana.

Tersely, original order No. 322 Dated 14-03-2024 was received from Sh. Jaskiran Sondh, Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana at Police Station for registration of FIR which reads thus: -

"It is informed that one complaint case bearing No. COMI/37123/2013 titled as "Rajni @ Rajjo vs. Shant Verma and others" u/s 406, 498-A of IPC, is pending in the Court of undersigned, There are four accused in the said complaint and their sureties have been furnished by Ravi Kumar, Mohd. Ali, Inderjeet Singh and Dharminder Kumar. 1. Ravi Kumar s/o Rajesh Kumar r/o house no. 606, Ambedkar Nagar, ward no.- 4 Ludhiana stood surety of Accused Shant Verma @ son of late Ashok Kumar resi of House no. 176419, ward no.-7, Rajeev Nagri, new bus stand, Jalalabad (W) District Fazilka at present Clerk in the office civil surgeon Civil Hospital, Ferozpur City. Surety Ravi Kumar furnished Jamabandi for the year 2012-13, Hadbasat No. 263, Jamabandi/Khewat no -290 Khatoni no.-365 of Vill.-Gill-2 and it was inquired through the Tehsildar (south), Ludhiana. As per report received from office of Tehsildar (South) regarding above said surety vide letter. No.-682 dated 24.03,2023 and letter no.-1023 dated 25.04.2023 The Jamabandi record submitted by the surety Ravi Kumar is mismatched with original jamabandi, 2. Mohd. Ali s/o Slamuddin r/o house no.-196-C-1, street no.-4, New Kartar Nagar. Ludhiana stood surety for Accused Kanta Rani wife of Late Ashok Kumar resident of House no. 1764/9, ward no. 7, Rajeev Nagri, near Bus stand, Jalalabad (w), District Fazilka. 3. Inderjeet Singh s/o Gainda Lal r/o Joseph School, Dhandra Road, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar Dugri Ludhiana stood fake surety for Accused Monika wife of Param @Micky daughter of Ashok Kumar resident of House no.-1764/9, Ward no. 7, Rajeev Nagar, near Bus stand, Jalalabad (W) District Fazilka. 4. Dharminder Kumar s/o Girja Kumar r/o house no. 699, street no. 11, Block- C, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, Gill Ludhiana stood surety for Accused Ravinder Kumar son of Late Ashok Kumar resident of House no. 1764/9, ward no. 7, Rajeev Nagri, near Bus stand, Jalalabad (w) District Fazilka,

The sureties from Sr. 2 to 4 has submitted the same Jamabandi for the year 2012-13, Hadbasat no 178, Khewat no. 17, Khatoni no. 19 of Vill.- Kuliyawal, Ludhiana and it was inquired from the officer of Tehsildar (East). As per report received from office of Tehsildar (East) regarding above said three sureties vide letter no.- 97 dated 26.05.2023 that Jamabandi record are mismatched with original Jamabandi. From the reports received from the concerned Tehsildar, it is prima facie appears that sureties have furnished fake documents in the Court and they have committed the offence of forgery in connivance with accused person I have been authorized by the Ld. District & Sessions Judge, Ludhiana to take legal action against such persons as per law. Appropriate action by registering the FIR against the above named person and his companions, who helped them in forging said Jamabandies be taken and copy of FIR be provided.”

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the case set up by the prosecution against the petitioner is that he furnished fake surety bonds on the basis of forged revenue document in Court to secure release of one Monika. He contends that the petitioner is in custody since 30.05.2025 and has no criminal antecedents. He further submits that the offences are triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate and that the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 09 months, as such, he be granted the concession of regular bail.

State counsel, on the other hand, does not dispute the facts as noticed above.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances noticed above, clean antecedents of the petitioner, the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner which is nearly 09 months, the stage of the trial where no witness has been examined

yet out of total 12 witnesses cited by the prosecution and that the offences are triable by the Judicial Magistrate, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

March 11, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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