

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

**CRM-M-42967-2025
Reserved on: 08.09.2025
Pronounced on: 08.10.2025**

VINOD KUMAR

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr.Sanchit Punia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Dr. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
173	02.08.2024	Uklana, Hisar	419/420/465/467/468/120-B/ 201 of IPC

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
2. Per paragraph 15 of the bail application and para 4(D) of the reply, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the order dated 12.06.2025 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Special Court-Vacation Judge, Hisar, which reads as follows:

“2. The instant FIR was registered on the basis of complaint received from the office of Sub Divisional Engineer, Public Health Engg.Sub Division, Barwala. These are the facts of the case that in Uklana Town, a lot of vacant land of the Public Works of Health Department is lying in front of the Waster Works of Uklana. On some part of which, Uklana Municipality build a shop and used to collect rent from them. Recently, the team of Chief Minister Flying Squad had come to Uklana for investigation, on which they came to know that the land lying vacant in front of Water Works Uklana measuring about 325 square yards was registered by Gurnam son of Mahenderpratap in a fraudulent manner by preparing fake registry. By putting his photo on it, he has applied for grabbing 325 square yards to government land adjacent to Water Works Uklana by downloading it fraudulently on the NDC portal. All the proceeding was done by Garnam son of Mahenderpratap, resident of Barwala. All the documents have been uploaded on the NDC site. Application ID No. is 0722056082. During investigation, it was found that uploading was done on 5.5.2023 through the mobile number 8901833349 of Vinod Kumar son of Phool Kumar, resident of Hisar (petitioner-

accused). A prayer was made for taking action against the accused because the land that Gurnam has shown as his own belongs to the Public Health Department. On the basis of said complaint, FIR u/ss 420, 419, 465, 467, 468, 120B IPC was registered. During investigation, Sub Divisional Officer, Public Health Engg. Sub Division I was joined in the investigation. During investigation, record was obtained from Sub Tehsil office Mandi Uklan and Municipal Committee, Uklana, which was taken into police possession vide separate recovery memo. Statements of witnesses u/s 161 Cr.P.C. were recorded. Accused Gurnam was arrested and he suffered his disclosure statement and in pursuance of same, he demarcated the place of occurrence. Aadhar Card of Gurnam was taken into police possession vide separate recovery memo. During investigation, accused Vinod was also arrested and he also suffered his disclosure statement and he also got recovered laptop used in the commission of offence, which was taken into police possession vide separate recovery memo. Investigation is pending.”

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

A. The evidence based on which the petitioner was arraigned as an accused:-

The petitioner on the basis of forged/by cutting in the original Sale- deed No.901 dated 03.07.2007, applied for NDC of the land belongs to Public Health, Barwala. Further he prepared forged affidavit and prepared forged photographs for obtaining NDC of land in connivance with co-accused Gurnam Singh.

B. The evidence against the petitioner:-

Forged Sale-Deed, Affidavit and photographs of the land which were uploaded at the time of applying for NDC, the petitioner and co- accused Gurnam Singh cleverly destroyed the SIM, Mobile and Affidavit. SIM through which online application was moved at that time, was registered in the name of petitioner/accused.

C. The role of the petitioner:-

To prepare forged Sale-Deed, Affidavit and photographs of the land of the Government and to destroy the SIM, Mobile and affidavit.”

REASONING:

7. There is a delay of one year and three months in lodging the FIR. Furthermore, the petitioner is neither a buyer, seller, nor a witness in the sale deed in connection with which the arrest is required. There is sufficient prima facie evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. Per paragraph 06 of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 23.05.2025. Per the custody certificate dated 05.09.2025, the petitioner's total custody in this FIR is 03 months and 12 days.

8. The law of bail, like any other branch of law, has its own philosophy, and occupies an important place in the administration of justice and the concept of bail emerges from the conflict between the police power to restrict liberty of a man who is alleged to have committed a crime, and presumption of innocence in favour of the alleged criminal.¹ In deciding bail applications an important factor which should certainly be taken into consideration by the Court is the delay in concluding the trial.—Often this takes several years, and if the accused is denied bail but is ultimately acquitted, who will restore so many years of his life spent in custody? —Is Article 21 of the Constitution, which is the most basic of all the fundamental rights in our Constitution, not violated in such a case? —Of course this is not the only factor, but it is certainly one of the important factors in deciding whether to grant bail.² Personal liberty is a very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.³ Personal liberty deprived when bail is refused, is too precious a value of our constitutional system recognised under Art. 21 that the curial power to negate it is a great trust exercisable, not casually, but judicially with lively concern for the cost to the individual and the community.⁴ When the undertrial prisoners are detained in jail custody to an indefinite period, Article 21 of the Constitution is violated.⁵

9. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

10. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

11. Given the above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner

1 Supreme Court of India in Vaman Narain Ghiya v. state of Rajasthan, [E-SCR] ; [2008] 17 SCR 369, Para 16, decided on 12.12.2008.

2 Supreme Court of India in State of Kerala v. Raneef, SC 2J [E-SCR]; [2011] 1 SCR 590, Para 4, decided on 03.01.2011.

3 Supreme Court of India in Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, SC 2J [E-SCR], Paragraph 127, decided on 02.12.2010.

4 Supreme Court of India in Babu Singh & ors v. State of UP, [E-SCR] P. 777, decided on 31.01.1978.

5 Supreme Court of India in Sanjay Chandra v. CBI , [2011] 13 (ADDL.) S.C.R. 309, Para 26, [E-SCR], decided on 23.11.2011.

shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilqa Magistrate or duty Magistrate, with or without sureties, with a maximum bond amount not to exceed INR 10,000.

12. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, the surety is capable of producing the accused. However, instead of surety, the petitioner may provide a fixed deposit of INR 10,000/-, with a clause that the interest shall not be accumulated in FD, either drawn from a State-owned bank or any bank listed on the National Stock Exchange and/or Bombay Stock Exchange, in favour of the "Chief Judicial Magistrate" of the concerned Sessions Division; or a fixed deposit made in the name of the petitioner, with similar terms and with endorsement from the banker stating that the FD shall not be encumbered or redeemed without the permission of the concerned trial Court, or until the surety bond has been discharged.

13. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

14. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

15. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case, or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

16. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

17. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

18. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

19. It is clarified that this bail order shall not be considered as a blanket bail order in any other matter and is only limited to granting bail in the FIR mentioned above.

20. In *Amit Rana v. State of Haryana*, CRM-18469-2025 [Decided on 05.08.2025], in CRA-D-123-2020], a Division Bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court in paragraph 13, holds that “To ensure that every person in judicial custody who has been granted bail or whose sentence has been suspended gets back their liberty without any delay, it is appropriate that whenever the bail order or the orders of suspension of sentence are not immediately sent by the Registry, computer systems, or Public Prosecutor, then in such a situation, to facilitate the immediate restoration of the liberty granted by any Court, the downloaded copies of all such orders, subject to verification, must be accepted by the Court before whom the bail bonds are furnished.”

21. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

08.10.2025

renubala

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.