





appeal on time. He was also threatened and forced to sign papers. The fraud was discovered later when a suspicious mutation entry was noticed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case; the dispute between the parties is purely of civil nature; there is no specific allegation levelled against the petitioner that he forged and fabricated any documents; even the complainant did not file any appeal before revenue authorities being aggrieved of matter but filed a civil suit for mandatory and permanent injunction; the petitioner was earlier granted the relief of anticipatory bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani vide order dated 26.02.2026 but later on, the said relief was withdrawn vide order dated 09.03.2026; the petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other case; he is not required for custodial interrogation as nothing is to be recovered from him and he is ready to join investigation and co-operate with the investigating agency. As such, learned counsel prayed for relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel opposed the prayer made by the petitioner by submitting that petitioner is involved in a racket in collusion with officers of revenue department, and on the basis of forged and fabricated manipulation of  *khasra girdawari* , the accused persons defeated the lawful right of the complainant, who is  *gair maroosi*  tenant in that land in the revenue record. Petitioner is the main conspirator and there are specific allegations levelled against him. It is further alleged that he used threats and coercion to obtain signatures on documents and obstructed the complainant's access to his fields. Overall, he is portrayed as a principal beneficiary and active participant in a coordinated land fraud, and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required



to crack the case and to collect evidence for success of the prosecution case and prayed for dismissal of present petition.

5. Mr. Ashish Rana, Advocate with Rockey Goyat, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant/respondent No.2 and filed his power of attorney, which is taken on record. Learned counsel vehemently opposed the prayer made by the petitioner by submitting that there is a gang which is operating in Bawani Khera tehsil, including the officials of revenue department, Advocates as well as other private persons; in the present case, the petitioner is the kingpin of the fraud, wherein forged and fabricated documents were used for correction of  *khasra, girdawari*. The main accused Virender was in touch with the petitioner and there is a proof that the forged documents were sent to the petitioner for correction of  *khasra girdawari*; the petitioner is also beneficiary of the said fraud as he got some part of land from co-accused Virender. Hence, learned counsel prayed for dismissal of present petition seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard.

7. As per the facts and circumstances of the case and the contentions of learned counsel for the parties, the allegations against the petitioner are that he is a key conspirator in a planned scheme to illegally dispossess the complainant from his land and transfer it in favour of his wife, namely, Meena; the petitioner acted in collusion with co-accused and revenue officials to manipulate proceedings through forged signatures, fake summons, and fraudulent mutation records; the petitioner along with co-accused used forged death certificate of living persons i.e. brother and sisters of Varinder and also impersonated the complainant and his brother Satyawar. Further, it is alleged



that petitioner used forged signatures on documents and obstructed the complainant’s access to his fields. In totality of the aforesaid facts, the allegation against the petitioner is that he actively participated in the alleged land fraud conspiracy and is the principal beneficiary thereof, hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for collection of evidence to crack the case. Accordingly, the petitioner is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail.

8. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in case titled as ‘*CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806*’ decided on 03.08.1997, emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, rather than from a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. So, taking into consideration the overall allegations against the petitioner, seriousness of the offence and requirement of the petitioner for his custodial interrogation, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

March 20, 2026  
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)  
JUDGE

|      |                           |        |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable        | Yes/No |