



CRM-M-71906-2025

1

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

Sr. No.122

CRM-M-71906-2025  
Date of Decision: 23.02.2026

MANJIT KUMAR ALIAS MANJEET KUMAR

...Petitioner

**Versus**

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present:- Mr. V.S. Verma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)**

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 170 dated 07.03.2024, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B and 201 IPC, at Police Station Camp, Palwal, District Palwal, Haryana.

2. In brief, the prosecution case is that a complaint was received from the Superintendent of Police, Palwal, based on an inquiry conducted by the Intelligence Department, Panchkula, alleging that certain residents of village Ladmaki, District Palwal, in connivance with officials/employees of the District Social Welfare Department, had fraudulently procured old-age pensions by preparing forged documents. The inquiry revealed that age-assessment certificates purportedly issued by the Medical Board of General Hospital, Palwal, were fake, and verification by the Chief Medical Officer confirmed that the signatures on those certificates did not belong to the concerned doctor. Further verification from the District Election Office

**CRM-M-71906-2025****2**

showed discrepancies in date of birth recorded on voter ID cards submitted with the applications, indicating that forged voter IDs had also been used. Investigation further disclosed that instead of verifying original documents, departmental officials relied upon online application copies and approved pension benefits. It was alleged that the approvals were granted in conspiracy by departmental staff, including clerks and data entry operators, in collusion with senior officers, thereby facilitating sanction of pensions on the basis of fabricated records and concealing original documents. On these allegations, offences under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B and 201 IPC were found to be made out and FIR No. 170 dated 07.03.2024 was registered at Police Station Camp, Palwal.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and no material exists on record to establish his involvement in the alleged offences. It is submitted that the petitioner was merely working as a Data Entry/Computer Operator in the office of the District Social Welfare Officer, Palwal, and had no role in preparation, verification, approval, or sanction of any documents relating to pension benefits. No recovery has been effected from him, no beneficiary has made any complaint against him, and no financial gain has been attributed to him. His duties were purely clerical and ministerial, limited to receiving applications, uploading data, affixing office stamps for completeness, and forwarding files to competent authorities, without any power of scrutiny or decision-making.

4. It is further argued that the petitioner has been in custody since 22.08.2025, investigation is complete, challan has already been presented,



CRM-M-71906-2025

3

and the trial is likely to take considerable time as several prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. The role attributed to the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature, and he has been arrayed as an accused solely due to his employment in the concerned office. It is thus prayed that continued incarceration is unwarranted and the petitioner deserves concession of regular bail.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. It is contended that the petitioner was actively involved in preparation and processing of forged documents relating to old-age pension beneficiaries and had knowingly facilitated approval of pensions on the basis of fabricated medical certificates and forged records. The investigation has revealed his role in the conspiracy along with other co-accused persons and the material collected during investigation *prima facie* establishes his complicity. It is further argued that the prosecution case is supported by documentary evidence as well as official records, and the petitioner's disclosure statement also indicates his involvement. Learned State counsel further submits that several material prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined and as many as eleven accused persons are still absconding and yet to be arrested. Therefore, if released on bail, there is every likelihood that the petitioner may influence witnesses, tamper with evidence, or hamper the ongoing investigation and trial. On these grounds, it is prayed that the bail application be dismissed.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court finds that the accusations levelled against the petitioner



CRM-M-71906-2025

4

pertain to an organized conspiracy involving preparation and use of forged documents for securing government benefits, which constitutes a serious economic offence affecting public funds and the integrity of public administration. The material collected during investigation *prima facie* discloses the petitioner's participation in the alleged acts, and the nature of allegations cannot be said to be trivial or doubtful at this stage. The Court also notes that material prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined and a substantial number of co-accused, stated to be eleven in number, are still to be apprehended. In such circumstances, the possibility of the petitioner influencing witnesses or obstructing the course of justice cannot be ruled out.

7. Considering the gravity of allegations, the stage of trial, the pending arrest of co-accused, and the potential risk of interference with evidence, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail at this stage. Accordingly, the present regular bail application is dismissed.

8. However, anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

23.02.2026

Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)  
JUDGE

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