

**CRM-M-69165-2025****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****146****CRM-M-69165-2025****Decided on :16.03.2026**

Avtar Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. I.P.S. Kohli, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Iqbalpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.185 dated 17.10.2025, under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Ludhiana.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, FIR has been registered on the basis of secret information alleging that Ram Kumar, s/o Ranjit Kumar, in connivance with his companions, was preparing and supplying forged dope reports by affixing the signatures and seals of the concerned doctor, to persons who approached the hospital for obtaining such reports.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that prime accused is Ram Kumar, who is already in judicial custody. Petitioner's name has been involved in the case only on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused, which is inherently weak and insufficient evidence. Learned counsel further submits that the signatures of doctors are allegedly forged for the purpose of preparing forged dope test reports,

**CRM-M-69165-2025****2**

by affixing the seals of the concerned doctors and supplying them to persons applying for arms licenses.

Counsel further submits that petitioner is stated to have been working in the laboratory of the Civil Hospital along with co-accused Ram Kumar, and the allegations against him are that he, together with Ram Kumar, allegedly prepared the forged reports.

Counsel contends that the allegations require verification through technical and documentary evidence, such as examination of handwriting and signatures on the dope test reports. Counsel also submits that investigation in the case has already been completed, final report has been submitted, and charges were framed on 20.12.2025. Trial is likely to take considerable time as no prosecution witness has been examined till date. Petitioner is in judicial custody for a period of last four months and twenty-one days, and no other case is pending against him. Considering that the offences are triable by the learned Magistrate, learned counsel prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner has been implicated in the offence of preparing and supplying forged dope reports, and his custodial presence may be required for verification of documents, technical examination, and completion of investigation. Learned State counsel further submits that fact that no prosecution witness has yet been examined does not diminish the seriousness of the allegations. Petitioner's involvement, as disclosed in the statement of co-accused, cannot be ignored, and granting bail at this stage may prejudice the

**CRM-M-69165-2025****3**

investigation. In view of these circumstances, counsel prays for dismissal of present petition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book along with the documents appended thereto.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner is in judicial custody for a period of the last four months and twenty-one days, trial is likely to take considerable time as no prosecution witness has yet been examined till date, and the offences are triable by the learned Magistrate, this Court finds no substantial justification to continue his detention. Thus, without commenting on the merits of the case, 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.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, 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.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.03.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No