



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh

105

CRM-M-68427-2025 (O&M)

Santosh Rani ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

(II) CRM-M-68431-2025 (O&M)

Naseeb Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

Date of Decision:- 04.12.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Vijay Kumar Jindal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Abhishek Shukla, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. Both these petitions under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, have been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, namely, Santosh Rani and Naseeb Singh in case bearing FIR No.367 dated 16.11.2025, registered under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, at Police Station Butana, District Karnal.



CRM-M-68427-2025 (O&M) and
CRM-M-68431-2025 (O&M)

(2)

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner Naseeb Singh is partner of M/s United Foods and the complete paddy/rice stock is available at his mill premises. The petitioners have already filed a civil suit in which petitioner Naseeb Singh has also filed an application for appointment of Local Commissioner to visit at the spot and to submit report regarding quantity of the paddy/rice available in the mill premises. Petitioner Santosh Rani is housewife and she is sleeping partner of M/s United Foods and she does not participate actively in day to day affairs of the Mill and a General Power of Attorney has been executed in favour of her husband, and partner in the firm/co-accused Naseeb Singh. Learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners as they are ready and willing to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance as advance copy of petitions had been served to respondent-State and upon instructions from ASI Sachin, he opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners by submitting that during investigation inspection was conducted, and approximately 1005 metric tons of paddy was found missing. The allegation against the present petitioners is that there is a shortage in the paddy handed over to the petitioners for milling and the petitioners are trying to replace the paddy handed over with an inferior quality procured from Uttarakhand. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation to unearth the whole *modus of operandi* adopted by them.



CRM-M-68427-2025 (O&M) and
CRM-M-68431-2025 (O&M) (3)

5. Heard.

6. The allegation against the present petitioners is that there is a shortage of 1005 metric tons of the paddy which was handed over to them for milling, further they are trying to replace it by an inferior quality by substituting it with paddy procured from Uttarakhand. In view of the above discussion, their custodial interrogation is required to unearth the true facts of the case and to track the embezzlement as alleged. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as '**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806**' decided on 03.08.1997, has held as under:-

"...custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation orientated than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this effective interrogation of 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 would not conduct themselves as offenders."

7. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the present petition stands dismissed.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.



CRM-M-68427-2025 (O&M) and
CRM-M-68431-2025 (O&M) (4)

9. A copy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

04.12.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No