



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M No.1197 of 2025
Date of decision: 29th April, 2025

Ravinder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. B.S. Jatana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Imran Ahmad Ali, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS in case bearing FIR No.0216 dated 31.08.2024 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Tripuri, District Patiala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 01.09.2024 and the case against him is founded entirely on documentary evidence. It is contended that the only role attributed to the petitioner is that of having attested a sale deed which is alleged to be fabricated. However, the petitioner is not a beneficiary of the alleged transaction.

3. It is further submitted that the challan has already been filed before the trial Court and charges have been framed. Given that the

case is based entirely on documentary evidence and all material evidence forms part of the chargesheet, it is urged that there exists no possibility of the petitioner tampering with the evidence, should he be released on bail. Learned counsel also points out that the trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude, as none of the 16 prosecution witnesses cited have been examined so far. It has also been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner may be put to any stringent conditions, while being enlarged on bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor the fact that the case of the prosecution rests entirely on documentary evidence, which is already part of the challan. However, it has been submitted that the petitioner is alleged to be associated with the land mafia involved in preparing fraudulent documents relating to properties. It has also been submitted that the petitioner has been involved in similar cases in the past and that his role in attesting a forged sale deed cannot be viewed in isolation.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. Undisputedly, the present case is based entirely on documentary evidence, which has already been collected and forms part of the charge sheet. The petitioner has been in custody since 01.09.2024. The trial is not likely to conclude in the near future, particularly in view of the fact that none of the 16 prosecution witnesses have been examined till date. In such circumstances, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. Although, the petitioner is

stated to be involved in other similar cases, the apprehension of misuse of the concession of bail can be addressed by imposing stringent conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate. It is clarified that the learned Magistrate shall be at liberty to impose such stringent conditions as may be deemed appropriate to ensure the petitioner's cooperation with the trial. Furthermore, in case the petitioner is found involved in any other criminal case during the pendency of the trial in the present case, or if he misuses the concession of bail in any manner, it shall be open to the prosecution to move for cancellation of bail.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

April 29, 2025

rps

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