



110

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-27531-2026**

Sat Narayan

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

Date of Decision: May 14, 2026**Date of Uploading: May 14, 2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL****Present:** Mr. Sunil Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal Singla, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vishwajeet, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the BNSS')
for grant of pre-arrest/anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case bearing
FIR No.239 dated 11.08.2023 registered under Sections 406, 419, 420, 467,
468, 471, 201 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Civil Lines, Jind.

2. The gravamen of the instant FIR reflects that it has been
registered on the basis of a complaint moved by the complainant—Jeet
Singh son of Baljore Singh. In his complaint, the complainant has stated
that he used to assist his nephew at a washing service station situated at
Safidon Road, Jind. In the year 2017, accused Anil Kumar son of the
present petitioner allegedly came to his service station for getting his vehicle

washed and introduced himself as an Inspector in the Income Tax Department posted at Kaithal. It is alleged that accused Anil Kumar represented to the complainant that he had close connections with senior officials in the Income Tax Department and could secure a government job for any person in lieu of payment of ₹34 lakhs. The complainant alleged that accused Anil Kumar frequently visited the service station and used to make the complainant speak with different persons over mobile phone while describing them to be senior officers and Commissioners in the Department. The complainant further alleged that accused Anil Kumar arranged a telephonic conversation with one Surender Singh Rana, who was projected as a Commissioner posted at Chandigarh, and thereby induced the complainant to believe that he possessed strong influence in the Department. Thereafter, accused Anil Kumar allegedly assured the complainant that he could secure the appointment of the complainant's son-in-law, namely Suresh Kumar, as an Inspector in the Income Tax/Excise Department for a total consideration of Rs.34 lakhs. The complainant has further alleged that, acting upon such inducement, he initially paid an amount of Rs.5 lakhs to accused Anil Kumar in the year 2017. Thereafter, on 16.01.2018, after encashing his fixed deposits and borrowing money from other persons, he allegedly paid another sum of Rs.10 lakhs to accused Anil Kumar. It has further been alleged that the complainant borrowed additional amounts from his friends and relatives and continued to hand over money to the accused persons from time to time.

The complainant further alleged that during the said period, he visited the rented house of accused Anil Kumar situated at New Jawahar Nagar Colony, Safidon Road, Jind, where he met the present petitioner namely Sat Narayan, who is father of accused Anil Kumar, along with other

co-accused persons. It is alleged that the petitioner and other co-accused persons assured the complainant that they were closely acquainted with the aforesaid Commissioner and that the job of his son-in-law was secured. The complainant further alleged that accused persons showed him a copy of OMR sheet and certain documents relating to the recruitment process, which strengthened his belief regarding the genuineness of the assurance extended by the accused persons.

The complainant further alleged that on 27.07.2018, after arranging money from his relatives and friends, he paid further amounts to the accused persons and, in this manner, a total sum of Rs.34 lakhs was allegedly handed over to them. It has also been alleged that the accused persons subsequently showed a fake joining letter pertaining to the post of Excise Inspector and assured the complainant that appointment of his son-in-law would be finalized. However, when the final selection list was declared and the name of the complainant's son-in-law did not appear therein. Upon verification, the complainant allegedly came to know that the joining letter and OMR sheet shown to him were forged and fabricated documents. The complainant further alleged that despite repeated demands, the accused persons neither returned the money nor gave any satisfactory explanation and instead started extending threats to him and his family members. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the present FIR came to be registered against the accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that a bare perusal of the FIR itself shows that allegations leveled against the petitioner are concocted, improbable and devoid of any merit. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. He has further contended that there is an inordinate delay

in registration of the FIR and that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner regarding receipt of the alleged amount. He has further argued that the entire case rests upon cash transactions unsupported by documentary evidence. It has further been argued that the petitioner is a 73 years old retired Army personnel with no criminal antecedents.

3.1. Learned counsel asserts that the custodial interrogation should not be used as a punitive measure and is justified only when absolutely necessary for the recovery of material evidence. Learned counsel has argued that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. Furthermore, the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and hence no useful purpose would be served by sending him behind the bars. On the aforesaid submissions, the grant of anticipatory bail is entreated for.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel (assisted by learned counsel for the complainant), opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that serious allegations of cheating and forgery involving an amount of Rs.34 lakhs have been levelled against the petitioner and co-accused persons. It has further been submitted that the petitioner actively participated in inducing the complainant to part with huge amounts on the false assurance of securing a government job for his son-in-law and that forged documents including fake joining letters and fabricated OMR sheets were prepared in furtherance of the conspiracy. Learned State counsel has further argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the larger conspiracy. Given the severity of the offence, there exists a substantial likelihood that the petitioner may abscond or tamper with the evidence, if she is enlarged on bail. On the strength of these submissions, dismissal of the petition in hand is entreated for.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available record of the case.

6. As per the case put forth in the FIR in question, the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. As per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner remained associated with the main accused and actively participated in assuring the complainant regarding securing a government job. The allegations further disclose preparation of forged documents and inducement of the complainant to part with substantial amounts of money. The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner regarding delay in lodging of the FIR or absence of any documentary proof with respect to the cash transactions, cannot be gone into in detail, at this stage. The investigation is at nascent stage and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for proper and effective investigation of the case.

No cause *nay* plausible cause has been shown, at this stage, from which it can be deciphered that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the present FIR.

7. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interests. The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It is imperative that every person in the Society can expect an atmosphere free from foreboding & fear of any transgression. At this stage, there is no material on record to hold that *prima facie* case is not made out against the petitioner. The material which has come on record and preliminary investigation appears to establish a

reasonable basis for the accusations. Thus, it is not appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as it would necessarily cause impediment in effective investigation. In *State v. Anil Sharma, (1997) 7 SCC 187: 1997 SCC (Cri) 1039*], the Supreme Court held as under : (SCC p. 189, para 6)

“6. We find force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third-degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

8. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, this Court finds no compelling ground to extend the benefit of discretionary relief to the petitioner. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for an effective investigation & to unravel the truth. The petition is, thus, devoid of merits and is hereby **dismissed**.

9. Nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

May 14, 2026

Naveen

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No