

CRM-M-71908-2025 (O & M)

2026:PHHC:036938



::1::

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(138)

CRM-M-71908-2025 (O & M)

Date of decision:10.03.2026

Manjit Kumar @ Manjeet Kumar

..... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Vikassheel Verma, Advocate, with
Ms. Aanchal Verma, Advocate and
Mr. Jasreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.346 dated 15.04.2022 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC (Section 201 IPC added) registered at Police Station Camp, Palwal, District Palwal, Haryana.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a Data Entry Operator and the allegations against him are that he facilitated taking the benefit of an Old Age Pension Scheme on the basis of fake documents to five persons. The said allegations are baseless. Be that as it may, the petitioner is in custody since 20.08.2025. The investigation stands completed. However, only 01 out of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be completed anytime soon and therefore, he be granted the concession of bail.



::2::

3. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, contends that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner and therefore, he ought not to be granted the concession as prayed for. He, however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 20.08.2025, that only 01 out of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and that the case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate.

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

5. 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.”

6. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner shall be adjudicated during the course of the Trial. Admittedly, the petitioner is in custody since 20.08.2025 but only 01 of the 18 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. The present case is triable by the Court of a Magistrate and no serious apprehension has been expressed by the State that the petitioner would abscond from justice, tamper with the evidence or



::3::

influence witnesses if granted the concession of bail. Therefore, in this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus, without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner, namely, Manjit Kumar @ Manjeet Kumar is ordered to be released on bail to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- 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 petitioner from Trial without sufficient cause.

9. The present petition stands disposed of.

10. The pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly.

March 10, 2026
sukhpreet

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No