



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

**CRM-M-45951-2025
Date of decision: 11.09.2025**

GULSHAN

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Manvender Chauhan, Advocate and
Mr. Mohit Kakkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Anu Garg, Advocate for
Mr. V.P. Sangwan, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This is the second petition filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.789 dated 26.12.2023 under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Bhiwani, District Bhiwani (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR; he has not prepared or forged birth certificate of the complainant's daughter. Learned counsel further contended that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Furthermore, there is no *iota* of evidence available on record to prove the complicity of the petitioner. Moreover, compromise has also been effected between the parties.



It is further submitted that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Lastly, learned counsel submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join investigation.

3. Learned State counsel has filed the Status report dated 08.09.2025 on behalf of respondent-State and the same is taken on record. A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer made by the petitioner and submits that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he is instrumental in preparing the fake birth certificate of daughter of the complainant by reducing her age from year '2006' to '2007' and on verification, the same was found to be forged one. Moreover, audio clip of the complainant and petitioner, in this regard, is also available with the investigating agency. Learned counsel further submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to know the *modus operandi* of the commission of offence. As such, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the allegations levelled against the petitioner that he is involved in forgery of birth certificate and to support this allegation levelled against the petitioner, there is sufficient material available on record in the form of audio clip etc. Further, the petitioner is required for matching of voice sample and for custodial interrogation to crack the case regarding the *modus operandi* for the commission of offence i.e. forging a birth certificate to take benefit of lesser age, affecting the right of other meritorious candidate. As such, no ground is made out to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.



6. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

September 11, 2025
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |