



227

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

CRM-M No.33642 of 2025

Date of Decision: 18.08.2025

Suresh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Robin Singh Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0156, dated 27.04.2023, under Sections 21(1) of Mines and Minerals (Regulation of Development) Act, and Sections 120-B, 379, 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC, registered at Police Station Chandimandir, Panchkula.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Omdutt Sharma, Mining Officer, Mines and Geology Department, Panchkula. It was alleged that 16,824 metric tonnes of raw mineral (gravel) was taken by the Director, M/s Balaji Washing Plant Village Rattewali outside Haryana through fake E-Ravana. The owner of the abovesaid plant i.e. M/s Balaji Washing Plant, had stolen minerals by illegally mining from



nearby rivers or other places. Thus, the plant owner along with his other associates has caused revenue loss to the government by misusing the departmental E-Ravana portal and illegally mined minerals have been validated by purchasing E-Ravana/bill from Rajasthan State only. A notice for depositing a fine for 16824 metric tonnes of minerals totalling Rs.33,74,800/- was also issued to the owner of the above said plant but the same has not been deposited. Thus, prayer was made to take the legal action. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioner surfaced and he was also arrayed as an accused in the present case. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. However, after hearing both the sides, finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula dismissed the petition filed by the petitioner vide his order dated 16.06.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner had no role in committing the alleged offence. It is submitted that the dispute had been settled between the main accused Narender Dangi and the Mines and Geology Department, Haryana. It is submitted that the petitioner had not signed any document. He submits that main accused Narender Dangi has already been granted bail by the



trial Court vide order dated 03.05.2025. He thus, submit that in the facts and circumstances, there being no *prima facie* case made against the petitioner, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Learned State counsel had opposed the submission made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner along with co-accused had forged the affidavit of original owner of M/s Balaji Stone Crusher and uploaded the said affidavit on online portal of the government in order to procure MDL and has misrepresented to the government by procuring fake bills from Rajasthan for carrying out illegal mining. He has submitted that no case for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out and thus the present petition being devoid of merit deserves to be dismissed.

5. On hearing of the counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the complicity of the petitioner has surfaced during investigation. He along with co-accused had forged affidavits of original owner of M/s Balaji Stone Crusher for carrying out the illegal mining. His mobile phone was used to upload the forged affidavits on the government portal. On the 28.07.2025, during the course of hearing, it was contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was in financial crises and thus, he be granted 02 weeks time for depositing Rs.10 lacs to show his *bona fide*. This Court accepted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner by making it clear that if Rs.10 lacs as submitted before this Court, are not deposited within the stipulated time, the interim protection granted to him, would be vacated.



The undertaking given by the counsel has not been complied with and thus, this Court in the attending facts and circumstances find no ground to grant any further interim protection to the petitioner.

6. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) BNSS which reads as under:-

“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

1. *When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.*
2. *When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*
 - (i) *a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
 - (ii) *a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
 - (iii) *a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
 - (iv) *such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”*

7. As per the law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab***, AIR 1980 SC 1632, while granting anticipatory bail, the Court is to maintain a balance between the



individual liberty and the interest of society. However, the interest of the society would always prevail upon the right of personal liberty. The relevant part of the judgment is as follows:-

“31. *In regard to anticipatory bail, if the proposed accusation appears to stem not from motives of furthering the ends of justice but from some ulterior motive, the object being to injure and humiliate the applicant by having him arrested, a direction for the release of the applicant on bail in the event of his arrest would generally be made. On the other hand, if it appears likely, considering the antecedents of the applicant, that taking advantage of the order of anticipatory bail he will flee from justice, such an order would not be made. But the converse of these propositions is not necessarily true. That is to say, it cannot be laid down as an inexorable rule that anticipatory bail cannot be granted unless the proposed accusation appears to be actuated by mala fides; and, equally, that anticipatory bail must be granted if there is no fear that the applicant will abscond. There are several other considerations, too numerous to enumerate, the combined effect of which must weigh with the court while granting or rejecting anticipatory bail. The nature and seriousness of the proposed charges, the context of the events likely to lead to the making of the charges, a reasonable possibility of the applicant's presence not being secured at the trial, a reasonable apprehension that witnesses will be tampered with and "the larger interests of the public or the state" are some of the considerations which the court has to keep in mind while deciding an application for anticipatory bail. The relevance of these considerations was pointed out in State v. Captain Jagjit Singh (1962) 3*



SCR 622, which, though, was a case under the old Section 498 which corresponds to the present Section 439 of the Code. It is of paramount consideration to remember that the freedom of the individual is as necessary for the survival of the society as it is for the egoistic purposes of the individual. A person seeking anticipatory bail is still a free man entitled to the presumption of innocence. He is willing to submit to restraints on his freedom, by the acceptance of conditions which the court may think fit to impose, in consideration of the assurance that if arrested, he shall be enlarged on bail.”

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State Vs. Anil Sharma***, (1997) 7SCC 187, held as under:-

“6. We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third-degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct



themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

9. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioner has been prima facie found. Allegations made against the petitioner are serious in nature and in the facts and circumstances, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be essential and granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

10. In view of the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner does not qualify for the grant of anticipatory bail as the undertaking given by the counsel has not been complied and thus, no ground to grant any further interim protection to the petitioner is made out. Present petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

18.08.2025

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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