



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

CRM-M-33818-2025

Reserved on: 8th August, 2025

Pronounced on: 18th August, 2025

Sajjan Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate for the petitioner.

MS. Himani Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 112 dated 17.02.2023 registered under Sections 468, 467, 471, 474, 420, 417, 120-B and 201 of IPC and Section 66-D of Information Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of an order passed by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Fatehabad in case arising out of CHI No. 88 of 2021 CNR No. HRFT03-000218 of 2021 showing that one Maya Devi, who was an accused in the said case had been extended benefit of bail by the Court concerned. She furnished personal as well as surety bonds. One Ravi Kumar had furnished bonds as surety and he had been identified by Gulwinder Singh. The surety Ravi Kumar had



appended his affidavit affirming that he had not given surety in any other case and giving details of his property. On checking the credentials of the surety in the CIS surety module by the Aadhar card number given by the above named Ravi Kumar, it was found that no entry qua said aadhar number was found. However, it was revealed that Ravi Kumar had appeared as surety in some other case on the basis of a false Aadhar card and Aadhar card submitted in the concerned case was also found to be fake. As such, direction was given for proceeding against the surety and identified in accordance with law. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The above named Ravi Kumar Surety and Gulwinder Singh identifier were arrested. They disclosed that they had given surety bonds in other cases also. The above named Ravi Kumar and Gulwinder Singh were arrested. They suffered disclosure statement to the effect that surety bonds had been furnished by them in other case. On their disclosure statements to the effect that the present applicant had identified accused Ravi Kumar on the basis of a forged Aadhar card in some other case, he has been nominated as an accused in this case as well. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad vide order dated 21.06.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The accused Ravi Kumar belongs to his village only. He had identified him in some other case and not in the case bearing CHI No. 88 of 2021 CNR No. HRFT03-000218 of 2021. There is nothing to connect him with this case or the case in which the order for registration of FIR against the co-accused had been passed. His custodial



interrogation is not at all required for the purpose of this case. No recovery is to be effected from him. He is ready to join the investigation. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that the petitioner in-conivance with Ravi Kumar, who is an accused in this case as well as in case bearing CHI No. 88 of 2021 CNR No. HRFT03-000218 of 2021 titled as *State vs. Krishna and ors.* had identified the co-accused Ravi Kumar in other case. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The accused Ravi Kumar and Sonu who had stood surety/identifier in case titled as *State Vs. Krishna and ors.* had been nominated as accused in this case as it was found that they had made false representations before the Court while furnishing surety bonds qua accused Maya and had made identification on the basis of false Aadhar card. The name of petitioner was disclosed in the disclosure statement of the accused Ravi Kumar and Maya Devi to the effect that he had identified accused Ravi Kumar in some other case. Neither the details of such case have been mentioned in FIR or in the disclosure statement of the co-accused nor it is made out from the record that the petitioner was involved in the commission of the offences allegedly committed by the co-accused Ravi and Gulwinder in any manner whatsoever. Simply because of the reason that he had identified the accused Ravi Kumar in some other case, it cannot be assumed



that he was involved in this case or in case titled as *State vs. Krishna and others*. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to join the investigation within a period of ten days from today by appearing and surrendering before the Investigating/Arresting Officer and thereafter also as and when he will be called by the Investigating/Arresting Officer. He will co-operate with the investigation proceedings till the presentation of challan. In case of his failure to do so, it will be open for the prosecution to seek cancellation of bail. He will give the details of his mobile number(s), Aadhaar card, etc. to the Investigating Officer at the time of joining investigation.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

18th August, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No