



CRM-M-31710-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-31710-2026

Date of Decision: 29.05.2026

Karan Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. B.S. Beniwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.10 dated 20.01.2026, registered under Sections 406/420/467/468/471/120-B IPC, at Police Station Bhattu Kalan, Fatehabad.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that a complaint was filed for taking action against Uggersain Jyani, Karan Solanki (petitioner) and Ramesh by complainant, namely, Dalbir Singh. It was alleged that Uggersain Jyani, who runs M.D.S. Senior Secondary School in Village Kirdan, District Fatehabad, had enrolled the complainant's son, Devender Singh, and daughter, Poonam, in the school. Devender Singh had passed his 10th and 11th classes from the said school, while Poonam had passed her 9th, 10th and 11th classes therefrom. It was further alleged that Uggersain Jyani provided the 10th class Detailed Marks Certificates (DMCs) of both children from the Chennai Board and charged a sum of Rs. 90,000/- from the complainant for the same. Subsequently, when the complainant approached an Aadhaar card operator for updating the Aadhaar card of his son Devender



Singh, the operator refused to process the request on the ground that the DMCs produced were found to be duplicate. Hence, it was alleged that Uggersain Jyani had cheated and defrauded the complainant of Rs. 90,000/-. Thus, on the basis of the complaint, the FIR was registered. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad praying for grant of anticipatory bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 22.05.2026. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of anticipatory bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He contends that no specific overt act of preparing forged documents and manipulating official record, has been attributed to the petitioner. He contends that from the bare perusal of the FIR, it is apparent that there is no single allegation of cheating or fraud against the petitioner. He further contends that except taking Rs.30,000/-, SLC and other documents from the complainant for handing over the same to his relative, co-accused Ramesh Chander, there is nothing against the petitioner in the present case. He submits that the petitioner is not the beneficiary in the present case and even Uggersain Jyani, who was running the school in question, was found innocent during the investigation, thereby rendering the involvement of the present petitioner highly doubtful. He further contends that neither the petitioner was teacher in the said school at the time of the



alleged occurrence nor he had any connection with the alleged forged DMC, rather except the disclosure statements of co-accused Mange Ram and Ramesh Kumar, there is nothing against the petitioner. He, thus, contends that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, no *prima facie* case is made out against the petitioner, and hence, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He contends that during the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced. He contends that in case the petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, there are every chance of tampering with the evidence. He, thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required and hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance. The allegations in the present case pertain to preparation of forged educational certificates and cheating the complainant on the pretext of providing genuine documents and the complainant was cheated for an amount of Rs.90,000/-. The investigation conducted so far reveals the complicity of the petitioner in the alleged offence. During the course of investigation, it was revealed that the petitioner was working as a teacher in the said school where the children of the complainant were studying. It further surfaced that the petitioner had assured the complainant that he would arrange the 10th and 12th class certificates for his son and daughter. The allegations against the petitioner



are serious in nature and relate to offences involving forgery of public documents and cheating which put the future of the young generation at stake. Further, the investigation is still at a nascent stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears necessary for effective investigation and for unearthing the conspiracy, if any. In the event of grant of anticipatory bail, there is also a likelihood of the petitioner influencing witnesses or tampering with the evidence.

6. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) of BNSS which reads as under:-

482“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

- 1. When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.*
- 2. When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*
 - (i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
 - (ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
 - (iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
 - (iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3)*



of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section."

7. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State represented by CBI Vs. Anil Sharma**, (1997) 7 SCC 187 has held as under:-

"6. We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under [Section 438](#) if the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disintering many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Succession such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail during the time he 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 task of disintering offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

8. Hon'ble Apex Court in plethora of judicial precedents including **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab**, AIR 1980 SC 1632, has time and again reiterated that while considering the anticipatory bail the Court is to take into consideration the factors like gravity of offence, chances of accused tampering with the evidence and probabilities of his fleeing from justice etc. The Court should be circumspect about the impact of its decision on the society as well. The anticipatory bail is an extraordinary discretion which should be exercised in the extraordinary



circumstances.

9. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioner has been *prima facie* established. The investigation is at its threshold. Thus, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

10. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner does not qualify for exercising the extraordinary power by this Court in his favour. Resultantly, the petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

12. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

29.05.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned
Whether Reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

: Yes/No
: Yes/No