



CRM-M-11949-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

105

**CRM-M-11949-2026
Decided on: 24.03.2026**

RAJENDER

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Mohan Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.63 dated 17.02.2026, under Sections 61, 340, 338, 336(3), 319, 318(4) of Bharatiya Nayaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 read with Sections 120-B, 471, 467, 468, 416, 420 IPC registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Hisar.

2. Briefly stated, a complaint was received from the Court of learned District & Sessions Judge, Hisar that one Deepak, son of Inder Singh furnished surety bonds for accused Deepak @ Rahul. During this process, it transpired that some other person has manipulated the



documents and has impersonated as Deepak, son of Inder Singh and has misused his property documents as well. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; that signatures of the petitioner were obtained on the basis of a forged Adhaar card; that the petitioner who was then *Panch of the village* acted in good faith and in a bona fide manner by putting his signatures on the bail bonds based on the said forged Adhaar Cards, without any knowledge of forgery; the petitioner having been involved in a similar case, has already been granted regular bail by the Court of Additional District & Sessions Judge, Hisar. Learned counsel prayed for anticipatory bail as the petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR and despite repeated attempts, the petitioner did not join the investigation; upon further inquiry, the Sarpanch of the Village Kuleri gave in writing that there is no person named Deepak son of Inder Singh in the said village. Learned State counsel further contended that the allegations are serious in nature and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and hence, the petitioner does not deserve the



concession of anticipatory bail as the petitioner alongwith co-accused committed fraud with the Court by furnishing false surety.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts of the present case and the allegations against the present petitioner that he identified an impersonator and without the involvement of the present petitioner, the alleged offence could not have been committed; it is well within the knowledge of the petitioner being *Panch* of the village that the impersonator does not belong to the village and the said person is not known to him. Since the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature as he indulged in commission of forgery, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the true facts & for proper investigation, hence, this Court is not inclined in favour of granting extra-ordinary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. In State Represented by the ***C.B.I. v. Anil Sharma, 1997(7) SCC 187***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful information and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in 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 above, the present petitioner is not entitled for discretionary relief as prayed for and the present petition is hereby dismissed.



9. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

24.03.2026

Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO