



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

CRM-M-28949-2026

Date of Decision: 21.05.2026

Jitender Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Bijender Dhankar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in a case FIR No. 18, dated 28.01.2026, under Section 318(4), 61 of B.N.S, registered at Police Station Mundkati, District Palwal (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that even from the uncontroverted allegations levelled in the F.I.R, even though the same are denied, no offence is made out against the present petitioner. In fact, as per the admitted case of the prosecution, the petitioner had signed on the Power of Attorney as Jitinder Singh and not in place of the complainant and that too after informing the complainant himself. Even otherwise, the case is based on documentary evidence, which has already been taken into possession by the police and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required. He further contends that even the investigation was conducted by D.S.P, Hodal, Palwal and the allegations were found to be false on verification.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Sidhu Sr. DAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Yash Dev Kaushik, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of complainant by filing his Vakalatnama, which is taken on record and opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully in the present case.

6. In the present case, the only allegation levelled by the complainant is that the petitioner had wrongly filed the Power of Attorney before the revenue authorities during partition proceedings and he was not entitled to appear before the revenue authorities. However, it is not in dispute that the complainant has already challenged the partition proceedings before the competent Court of law and apparently, no loss has been caused to the complainant. Further in any case, the documentary evidence has already been collected by the police and in the considered opinion of the Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

7. Thus, at this stage, without commenting any further, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Sections 482 (2) of B.N.S.S. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join the investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

21.05.2026

hitesh

Whether speaking/reasoned

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No