



202

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

CRM-M-33555-2026

Date of decision : 16.06.2026

Charanpreet Singh @Channi

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sudesh Kumar Pandey, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.179 dated 19.08.2025, under Sections 204, 319(2), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Balongi, District S.A.S.Nagar.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged against the petitioner on the allegations that the petitioner moved an application by impersonating himself to be a Processing Officer, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India, through which he requested that he requires an office to do the work and when he was asked to submit the consent letter from the Ministry, the petitioner sent a letter *via* email which was signed by the Director (Personnel) in the above said Ministry and on verification, the same was found to be forged and fabricated. It was further alleged that through fake



and fabricated documents, he also requested the Additional Deputy Commissioner (General) SAS Nagar to assign police personnel to his duty as he needed to check the Government of India Schemes and to hold camps in the villages. Thus, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 19.08.2025. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented and on framing of the charges, trial commenced. The petitioner approached learned Additional Sessions Judge, SAS Nagar praying for grant of bail. However, on hearing counsel for both the sides, the same was declined vide order dated 30.03.2026. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing two petitions praying for grant of regular bail, however, the same were declined. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present third petition praying for grant of bail.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the allegations against the petitioner are to the effect that the petitioner projected himself as a Processing Officer in the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India. He submits that no security etc. as alleged against the petitioner, were provided to him. He submits that petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he is behind bars from last about 10 months. He submits that the investigation in the present case is complete and charges have also been framed, however, no witness has been examined so far. He, thus submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.



4. Per contra, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner has intentionally misled the authorities by projecting himself to be a Processing Officer. He submits that forged stickers of Government of Indian pasted on the car of the petitioner, were recovered, however, before the security as demanded by the petitioner could be granted, he was caught by the authorities concerned. He, on instructions, has submitted that investigation is complete, challan has been presented and charges have also been framed, however, out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was prosecuted in the abovementioned FIR and the allegations against the petitioner were that he allegedly tried to mislead the authorities for seeking police protection by way of filing of forged and fabricated documents, however, he was caught by the authorities before providing any security. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of about 10 months. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Investigation is complete and charges are also framed, however, out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned



counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

16.06.2026

ps-I

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

: Yes/No
: Yes/No