



CRM-M-38634-2025

1

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

234

**CRM-M-38634-2025
Decided on :16.09.2025**

Raj Bahadur @ Bahadur Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Deepanshu Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.82 dated 10.06.2023, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City-I, Malerkotla.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner in the instant case is that he committed fraud with the Court by furnishing false and fabricated documents at the time of furnishing surety bonds and even, impersonated himself as surety Sachit Verma for the purpose of verification and identification.

Further submits that all the offences in the case are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate and after completion of investigation though final report has been submitted, but out of total 18 prosecution

**CRM-M-38634-2025****2**

witnesses, none has been examined. Counsel submits that petitioner is inside jail since 15.03.2025 therefore, prays for the grant of regular bail.

3. While opposing the prayer of bail, learned State counsel submits that the present FIR was registered at the instance of the Reader posted in the Court of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Malerkotla, and no lenient view can be adopted in such matters. In fact, it is not cheating with the complainant or vis a vis some property, rather it is an act of playing fraud with the Court itself. Thus, prays for dismissal of the present petition.

4. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsel, and also gone through the record available before the Court.

5. From the record it is noticed that co-accused Vakesh Kumar has already been granted concession of anticipatory bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, vide its order dated 03.11.2023, passed in CRM-M-37943-2023 (Annexure P-4). Similarly, another co-accused, namely, Mohammad Aamir, has also been granted concession of anticipatory bail, vide order dated 03.11.2023, passed in CRM-M-35021-2023 (Annexure P-5) and another co-accused, namely, Avtar Singh and Saleem Khan, have also been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, vide orders dated 20.05.2025(P-3) and 07.07.2025 (P-2) respectively. Even the other aspects as argued by petitioner's counsel are also worth noticing. Moreover, all the offences are subject to the Magisterial trial, wherein process of recording statements of the

**CRM-M-38634-2025****3**

prosecution witnesses is yet to start. In all likelihood, considerable period would be consumed in culmination of the trial and liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed indefinitely. Therefore, plea for bail, at this stage, seems to be justifiable. Accordingly, taking note of all the aforementioned aspects, present petition is allowed, and 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 / Area Magistrate / Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

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

16.09.2025*Rashmi*

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