

**CRM-M-15756-2026****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

211

**CRM-M-15756-2026
Decided on : 11.05.2026****Ramesh Chander Verma****.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and others****.....Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH****Present:** Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG Haryana

Mr. Edwar Augustine George, Advocate and
Mr. Shubham Malik, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 and 3**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483(3) of BNSS (corresponding to Section 439(2) of Cr.P.C.) read with Section 528 of BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 Cr.P.C.), seeking quashing/setting aside of the order dated 26.06.2025 (P-8) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge/vacation Judge Karnal, granting anticipatory bail to respondents No. 2 and 3 in FIR No. 359 dated 17.06.2025, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and Section 120-B IPC (Corresponding to Sections 316/318/336/337/338 and 61(2) of BNS) registered at Police Station Sector 32-33 Karnal, District Karnal.

2. After considering the allegations, and while granting interim bail following was recorded by the Court of learned Additional Sessions

**CRM-M-15756-2026****Judge/vacation Judge, Karnal :**

"It has come out during the arguments that only Rs. 32 lacs were given by the complainant regarding which 50% partnership was offered to him against book value of Rs.64 lacs of the firm. Whether or not the documents are forged is a question which would only be established after evidence is collected by the police. The matter regarding firm is already pending before arbitrator. The dispute is regarding existence or non-existence of documentary evidence, which could be collected by the investigating agency during investigation of the case and for that purpose the custodial interrogation of the accused persons is not required. The documents, which have been claimed by the complainant to be forged, have not been alleged to be prepared in recent time and are pertaining to the year 2019 and 2023 respectively and are notarized. The dispute between the complainant and accused persons is since year 2023. The applicants have undertaken to cooperate with investigating agency and come present as and when called by investigating agency. No doubt a report of handwriting expert is there to show prima facie that signatures on the documents were not of complainant. On the other hand, it is also clear that documents i.e. memorandum and retirement deed are notarized documents. The applicants have already taken stand that these documents were in possession of complainant being beneficiary. Rest of the dispute is civil in nature,"

3. Thereupon, by observing that the petitioner has joined investigation and the case is primarily based on the documentary evidence, the interim bail order was confirmed and, thus, petition was allowed on 26.06.2025.

4. For setting aside of the said order, learned counsel for the petitioner argued that impugned bail order is based upon assumptions and the incorrect facts. However, counsel does not deny that the evidence already collected by the investigating agency is predominantly documentary in nature. Furthermore, no other substantial evidence is to be collected, requiring petitioner's custodial interrogation. Further submits, that given serious allegations and the FSL report, the respondents were not entitled for the said concession.



CRM-M-15756-2026

5. I have considered the submission addressed by respective counsels from both the sides.

6. May it be anticipatory bail or regular bail, same is granted by the Court, primarily on the principles of equity and a *prima facie* satisfaction with the submissions addressed by such accused. Not only the allegations, but Court also examines the need of it necessary or not because unless charges are proved, some times it may result in causing injustice to the accused.

7. Since, interim bail was granted by passing a detailed order and same was made absolute upon joining of the investigation and by holding that custodial interrogation would be meaningless, the concessional relief has been rightly granted to the petitioner

Furthermore, this Court or any next Court/superior Court is not competent to exercise its power as in appellate jurisdiction, while examining the bail already granted by the lower Court.

8. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

11.05.2026

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

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