

CRM-M-54867-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Sr. No.214 (3 cases)

Case No. : CRM-M-54867-2025

Decided On : November 12, 2025

Aman Petitioner
vs.
State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr. Virender Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sulinder Kumar, DAG, Haryana.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.578 dated 09.09.2025, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Kharkhoda, District Sonipat.

The brief facts of the present case are that complainant Alka, who had got registered the aforesaid FIR, was the owner of an i-20 car bearing registration No.HR-13-Q-7849, which met with an accident on 29.03.2021. The Insurance Company sanctioned claim of Rs.5,00,000/- to aforesaid Alka and sold the said accidental car to a scrap dealer. During investigation, it was found that the aforesaid car was found to have been taken on superdari by executing Power of Attorney in the name of one

**CRM-M-54867-2025****2**


Ravinder, for which Surender stood surety. On the basis of disclosure statement made by said Ravinder, the petitioner and other co-accused were found involved in cheating and forgery of documents, for taking the vehicles on superdari by hatching conspiracy.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case as he has nothing to do with the alleged offence and allegations levelled in the present case are false and frivolous. In fact, the petitioner has no connection with the complainant, the vehicle in question or any transaction related thereto. No specific role has been attributed to the petitioner in the FIR and his name surfaced merely on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Ravinder, which is not admissible in law. In these circumstances, learned counsel urged that the petitioner is not required for any interrogation and he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned State counsel opposed the present bail petition and contended that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature as he, along with other co-accused, conspired to cheat the police and judicial Authorities by using forged documents for taking vehicles on superdari. As such, his custodial interrogation is required for fair and proper investigation and therefore, he does not deserve concession of anticipatory bail.

Heard.

As per the allegations in the present FIR, the petitioner, along with other co-accused, got released vehicles Nos. UP-53-GJ-9969 and HR-13-Q-7849 by fraudulently getting signed the forged documents. As per the



Status Report, filed by learned State counsel, there is no allegation qua the petitioner regarding forging of the alleged Power of Attorney. He is neither the Power of Attorney holder nor was surety while getting these vehicles being released on superdari. There is no specific attribution to the petitioner. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose and nothing is to be recovered from him. So, no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. In the event of arrest, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, on furnishing bail/surety bonds, to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer, subject to the conditions, as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of along with the present petition.

November 12, 2025
monika

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ?	Yes/No.
Whether reportable ?	Yes/No.