



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

307

CRM-M-34523-2025  
Date of decision: 30.09.2025

Vinod Kumar alias Vinod ...Petitioner  
Versus  
State of Haryana ...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY**

Present : Ms. Samridhi Sareen, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikram Singh, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J.(ORAL)**

1. By virtue of the present petition under Section 483 BNSS, petitioner, an accused in case bearing FIR No.0009 dated 07.01.2025 registered against him, for commission of offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar, has prayed for grant of bail.

2. Relevant facts as emerging from documents on record be noticed hereinbelow:-

Pursuant to the orders received from the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar, criminal proceedings vide FIR No.0009 dated 07.01.2025 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, were initiated.

In brief, the contents of the order are as follows:-

*That one Ravi (co-accused) had furnished bail/surety bonds. Arjun son of Pali had appeared as surety for Ravi and had also furnished his Aadhar Card along with jamabandi etc. The aforesaid Ravi did not appear in the Court. Resultantly, his bail was cancelled. Notice to surety was issued. In pursuance to the said notice, some another person appeared in the Court, introduced himself as Arjun son of Pali and moved an application pointing therein that infact Rajesh Kumar son of Lakhi, resident of Uklana, had appeared as*



surety for Ravi and had produced forged Aadhar Card. The aforesaid Rajesh had impersonated him (Arjun) and had also furnished jamabandi of his land.

On the basis of these forged documents Ravi, who was in custody in case bearing FIR No.113 of 2023 under Sections 147, 323, 332, 353, 307 IPC was released on bail. On the receipt of this application, the Court directed to lodge the FIR.

Accordingly, FIR No.0009 dated 07.01.2025 was registered against Ravi and others under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC. During the course of investigation, all the documents, as in, bail application, power of attorney, surety bonds, copy of Jamabandi etc. were taken into possession. Arjun, son of Pali Ram, who had moved the application before the Court and his identifier Naresh Kumar son of Parbhati Ram were also joined the investigation. During the investigation, it came to the notice of the investigating agency that in order to get Ravi released on bail, Vinod (present petitioner) son of Prithvi in conspiracy with the others namely Jitender @ Chhala, Rajesh @ Raja, Naresh Kumar had prepared the forged Aadhar Card of Arjun son of Pali Ram, resident of Uklana, by affixing photo of co-accused Rajesh son of Lakhi Ram, meaning thereby that Rajesh son of Lakhi Ram had appeared as Arjun son of Pali Ram and had stood surety for Ravi. The aforesaid co-accused Rajesh was identified by co-accused Naresh Kumar. It also came to the notice of the IO that ID card issued by the Development and Panchayats Department, in favour of Arjun son of Pali Ram, had also been forged by Vinod etc. to create fake documents.

On 14.01.2025, petitioner-Vinod, co-accused Rajesh @ Raja, Jitender @ Chhala and Naresh were arrested. On 16.01.2025, co-accused Ravi was also arrested.

During the course of interrogation, petitioner confessed to his involvement in the commission of offences and elaborated upon the manner



in which this fraud played on the Court, was committed. Roles played by each of the accused were also elaborated upon.

Aggrieved of the order dated 16.06.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Hisar vide which bail application of petitioner was dismissed, the present petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel contends that petitioner, currently working as a 'Clerk' with a practicing advocate at District Courts, Hisar, has been falsely implicated. No direct or corroborative incriminating material was collected by the IO, during the course of investigation, to connect petitioner with the offence. He has been arrayed as accused only on the basis of hearsay and unverified allegations of the other co-accused, whose disclosure statements were recorded at one point in time. No mobile phone, computer printer etc. were taken into possession by the IO, which could even remotely suggest involvement of the petitioner in preparing forged documents. Continuing further, learned counsel contends that the petitioner is working under the supervision of the advocate, does not provide any legal advice, nor interacts with persons appearing as sureties etc. Verification and scrutiny of documents is exclusively handled by the advocate in accordance with the professional obligations and legal requirements. Thus, as per learned counsel, petitioner was not aware as to whether the person who had appeared as surety on behalf of co-accused Ravi was fake or genuine. Based only on the documents submitted by the said person, he (P) filled the surety bonds.

Learned counsel further contends that co-accused Ravi and Naresh have since been extended the concession of bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, vide orders dated 29.07.2025 and 03.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-39369-2025 and CRM-M-31067-2025, respectively, thus, similar treatment be meted out to petitioner, who has been in custody since



14.01.2025, moreso when challan has been filed and completion of trial (offences being magisterial triable) is likely to take some time. Further incarceration of petitioner, as per learned counsel, would not serve any useful purpose.

4. Status report by way of affidavit of Mr. Sunil Kumar, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hisar has been filed. In para 7 thereof, the role played by the petitioner has been highlighted, as being the person who orchestrated the entire offence, guided the other accused and they all in conspiracy with each other prepared forged Aadhar Card by affixing photograph of co-accused Rajesh on the Aadhar Card of Arjun, son of Pali Ram.

In para 5 of the status report, the questionable past antecedents of the petitioner have also been mentioned, who is involved in 3 other criminal cases, (FIR No.166/2023 under Section 385 IPC registered at P.S. City Hisar, FIR No. 183 dated 13.06.2025 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B registered at P.S. Civil Lines, Hisar and FIR No.243 dated 02.08.2025 under Sections 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 61 BNS registered at P.S. City Hisar).

It has also been pointed out that in the report that in pursuance of the disclosure statement suffered by the petitioner, recovery of mobile phone was effected, through which he had facilitated the commission of offence.

Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the connecting/incriminating material collected by the IO during the course of investigation, fully proves the complicity of the petitioner, who played a crucial role and is infact the kingpin of the entire incident. Dismissal of the present petition has been



prayed for.

5. Both the counsel have been heard and documents on record have been perused.

6. Before expressing any opinion on the merits of submission advanced by both the learned counsel, it would not be out of place to mention here that Hon'ble Supreme Court while taking cognizance of the menace of impersonation of sureties in **Petition(s) for *Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).4116/2021 titled as Rajesh Kumar Rathore vs. The State of Chhatisgarh*** issued notice to UIDAI to explore the feasibility of evolving mechanism to verify genuineness of the surety.

Imposing condition of furnishing surety bonds along with personal bonds, while allowing the bail application of any accused is primarily to ensure the presence of the accused during the trial. Furnishing fake surety bonds not only tempers with the process of justice but also erodes public confidence in criminal justice dispensation system and is in fact a fraud on the Court.

In so far as the case in hand is concerned, from the documents and connecting circumstances brought on record, it is quite apparent that the entire incident was committed with a premediated mind, it didn't happen at the spur of the moment. Present petitioner, who claims to have been falsely implicated and also claims to be working as a 'Clerk' with practicing Advocate at Hisar, appears to be the kingpin of the entire incident. It can further be inferred that he was approached by a friend of co-accused Ravi, who was already in custody in case bearing FIR No.113 of 2023 under Sections 147, 323, 332, 353, 307 IPC. This friend of co-accused Ravi requested Vinod (petitioner) to arrange for surety. That is when the other co-accused came into picture. Co-accused Rajesh in conspiracy with petitioner



and other co-accused, forged Aadhar Card of his cousin brother Arjun, by affixing his own photograph on the said Aadhar Card. Even the ID Card issued by Panchayats Development Department in favour of Arjun was forged. To prove solvency, revenue record of Arjun was also appended along with the surety bonds. The mobile phone through which the original documents were sent on 'Whatsapp' by the accused to each other, to prepare forged documents were also taken into possession.

Contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that co-accused Naresh Kumar and Ravi, who have been granted the concession of bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, are similarly situated as the present petitioner, thus similar treatment be meted out to him, has not found favour with the Court, for the reason that documents and other connecting circumstances brought on record, clearly suggest that petitioner was the one, who orchestrated the entire offence. As noted above, 3 other criminal cases, including one of the like nature, is pending against him, thus, simply because petitioner has been in custody since 14.01.2025, that by itself cannot be a ground, at this stage, to grant him the concession of bail, for if released on bail, there is every likelihood of him fleeing from the process of justice by not appearing in the Court and committing the same offence yet again.

7. In view of the discussion made hereinabove, the present petition is hereby dismissed. Learned trial Court is directed to make sincere efforts to expeditiously dispose of the case.

**(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)**  
**JUDGE**

**30.09.2025**

Hemant

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