



CRM-M-14797-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

110

**CRM-M-14797-2026
Decided on: 18.03.2026**

ANKIT

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. S. Aggarwal, 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.463 dated 11.12.2025, under Sections 318(4), 316(2) of Bharatiya Nayaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 registered at Police Station Kunjpura, District Karnal.

2. The allegations against the present petitioner are that he has taken Rs.10 lakh from the complainant and her husband on the pretext of sending their son to Canada but later on neither he sent complainant's son abroad nor returned complainant's money. The petitioner is also alleged to have given letter of Canadian Embassy New Delhi which was later on found to be forged.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; the matter is of civil nature; a loan was advanced by the complainant to the petitioner amounting to Rs.10 lakh; in lieu of the same, the petitioner issued cheques worth Rs.10.80 lakh to the complainant and Rs.one lakh was also transferred in the account of the complainant; a complaint under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act is already pending adjudication. It is further contended that no letter from the Canadian Embassy was ever handed over by the petitioner to the complainant; the present FIR has been lodged by giving the color of criminal complaint to a civil matter. Learned counsel prayed for anticipatory bail as he has clean & clear antecedents and 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 concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner while submitting on instructions from ASI-Harvish Kumar that the present petitioner duped the complainant to the tune of Rs.10 lakh by assuring him to send his son abroad and he also issued a forged letter purportedly from the Canadian Embassy showing the visa, however, period was not mentioned therein; hence, on suspicion, the complainant got it checked and the same was found to be forged and fabricated. There is also whatsapp chat between the complainant and the



petitioner showing the complicity of the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence. Learned counsel further contended that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in the present matter to collect the evidence and for recovery of the amount duped as well as to know the source and method of procurement/ fabrication of the alleged forged letter. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the present petition seeking anticipatory bail.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts & circumstances of the present case and the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties, the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature as he duped the complainant of Rs.10 lakh on his assurance to send the complainant's son abroad, and even a forged and fabricated letter i.e. documents regarding visa were also handed over to the complainant which were found to be fictitious; the Investigating Agency also has whatsapp chat showing complicity of the present petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence, as such the allegations against the present petitioner are serious in nature; custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for proper investigation, as well as recovery of remaining amount, and to know the source of such forged and fabricated documents. 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. Keeping in view the gravity of offence and the role assigned to the present petitioner, the 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

18.03.2026
Sonia Puri

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