



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

213

CRM-M-33014-2024

Date of decision: 29.10.2024

Sarfaraj

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present : Mr. Nafees Ahmad Khan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, AAG, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.151 dated 10.05.2023 for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC, registered at Police Station Punhana, District Nuh.

2. On 29.07.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned State counsel, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR in question and that he has no connection to the alleged offences, specifically the impersonation of the complainant and thereafter, the misuse of the complainant’s driving licence. He further submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.*



CRM-M-33014-2024

*Learned State counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to paragraph 3 of the reply filed and has submitted that the petitioner had fraudulently used the fake licence in the name of the complainant when the vehicle which he was driving was challaned. On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel, she has not been able to dispute the other averments made in the reply that it was Sarfaraj son of Usman who had been issuing fake licenses which were prepared by accused Tayyab Hussain. To corroborate her submission, she has referred to paragraph 8 of the reply which reads as under:*

*“That the role of the petitioner Sarfaraj S/o Isra in the present case is that he had used the fake driving license of the complainant at the time of his challan.”*”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 29.07.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 29.07.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS/438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

**29.10.2024**

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE**

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