



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

109

CRM-M-73445-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 24.12.2025

Pushpendra Kumar ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Abhinandan Jindal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. (482 of BNSS, 2023), has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.266 dated 01.10.2025, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Sarai Khawaja, Faridabad, Haryana.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as there is no specific allegation against him. There is an inordinate delay in lodging of the FIR as the alleged incident took place on 12.07.2025, however, the present FIR has been registered on 01.10.2025 i.e. after a gap of 2 months and 19 days. Another co-accused with whom, the present petitioner is on parity, namely, Bheem Singh Chandel has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court in **CRM-M No.62097 of 2025** vide order dated 06.11.2025 (Annexure P-4). Thus, learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as he is ready and willing to join the investigation.



CRM-M-73445-2025 (O&M)

(2)

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent-State, and opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the allegation against the present petitioner is serious in nature as he along with co-accused forged the signatures of complainant to make him guarantor for co-accused Yash Bhardwaj's loan. He received an amount of Rs.53,000/- in his bank account from co-accused Yash, who has availed the said loan, in which the complainant has been fraudulently shown as a guarantor.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view of contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties, the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature that he forged the signatures of complainant on the loan papers of co-accused Yash Bhardwaj; the petitioner received an amount of Rs.53,000/- from co-accused Yash, who is the beneficiary of the forgery; custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the true set of facts and extraction of material details about the *modus operandi* of all the accused, hence, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition seeking anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as '***CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806***' decided on 03.08.1997, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in



CRM-M-73445-2025 (O&M) (3)

custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

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

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

24.12.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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