



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

CRM-M-16140-2026

Date of decision: 11.05.2026

MAN MOHAN SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Arun Chander Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG Haryana.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.278 dated 31.08.2025, registered under Sections 120-B, 177, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC, at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case, are that the petitioner identified the surety Suraj Bhan who impersonated as Sanjeev Kumar and stood surety for one Lucky by furnishing forged and fabricated documents in case FIR No.113/2022. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He contends that the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he had identified the surety Suraj Bhan who impersonated himself as Sanjeev Kumar (complainant in this case) and it is in fact Suraj Bhan who stood



surety for accused Lucky Samsen by furnishing forged and fabricated documents in the Court. He submits that the petitioner has not produced any forged document in the Court. He further submits that the petitioner has not verified or identified any document of the surety produced by him in Court. He submits that the petitioner is a senior citizen and is suffering with age related ailments. He submits that the entire case is documentary in nature which is in the custody of the police and nothing is to be recovered from him. The petitioner is in custody since 28.11.2025. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented, charges have been framed and out of 10 prosecution witnesses none has been examined so far. Learned counsel further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report and custody certificate of the petitioner. She has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. She further submits that there are multiple other cases registered against the petitioner meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months and 13 days; the investigation is complete; challan stands presented, charges have been framed; out of 10 prosecution witnesses none has been examined and the fact that trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in



further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of her right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

7. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty



2026:PHHC:073090

2026:PHHC:073090



229

CRM-M-16140-2026

-4-

Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. All miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

11.05.2026

puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

i) Whether speaking/reasoned?
ii) Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No