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

(**102**)

CRM-M-34561-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:**02.07.2026**

RAMESH KUMAR … Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA ... Respondent

-.-

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Mayank Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

-.-

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present is the first petition instituted under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to the erstwhile Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973), invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court for the grant of anticipatory bail. The petitioner seeks a direction that, in the event of his arrest in connection with FIR No. 771 dated 10.12.2021, registered under Sections 120-B, 419, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh, he be released on anticipatory bail, in accordance with law.

2. The facts giving rise to the present petition are that a complaint dated 19.07.2021, submitted by Virender Singh, was referred to the Economic Offences Cell, Narnaul, for investigation. The complainant alleged that he and Rajbir are residents of Village Dikwad, Tehsil Neemrana, District Alwar (Rajasthan), and are *Biswedars* of Village

Ghatasher, Tehsil Narnaul. It was asserted that his grandmother, Murti Devi, daughter of Jeeta son of Godha, was the recorded owner of the land comprised in Khewat No. 64, Khatuni No. 78, Hadbast No. 284, situated within the revenue estate of Village Ghatasher, as reflected in the Jamabandi for the year 2014–15. Upon approaching the Halqua Patwari for sanction of the mutation of inheritance in his favour, the complainant allegedly discovered that the share of the deceased Murti Devi had already been transferred in favour of HSIIDC, Haryana, for the establishment of a logistics hub on the strength of a purportedly forged Sale Deed No. 3298 dated 05.02.2021. It was alleged that Ramesh Lambardar, in conspiracy with his brother Rakesh and other co-accused, had fraudulently impersonated a woman as Murti Devi, executed the aforesaid sale deed, and dishonestly obtained sale consideration through Cheque No. 896888 dated 05.02.2021 issued by the Government of Haryana. According to the complainant, the accused persons, acting in concert pursuant to a criminal conspiracy, forged revenue documents, impersonated the true owner, and dishonestly misappropriated the compensation amount, thereby committing the alleged offences, on the basis whereof the present FIR came to be registered.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that, being the Lambardar of the village, the petitioner was merely requested by the concerned Government officials to identify the executants for the purpose of facilitating the expeditious transfer of the land in favour of HSIIDC, Haryana, for establishment of the proposed logistics hub. According to the petitioner, he identified the lady

as Murti Devi bona fide and in good faith, without having any knowledge of the alleged impersonation or forgery. It is further argued that the petitioner neither derived any unlawful benefit from the transaction nor played any role in the execution of the impugned sale deed. Since the alleged impersonator has already been apprehended and arrested, it is submitted that no recovery remains to be effected from the petitioner and his custodial interrogation is neither warranted nor justified. On these premises, it is prayed that the petitioner be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the petition and submits that the petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail. It is contended that the petitioner is the principal architect and kingpin of the entire conspiracy. According to the prosecution, it was the petitioner who procured an impostor, projected her as Murti Devi, despite being fully aware that the real Murti Devi had expired on 10.09.1992, and facilitated the execution of the fraudulent sale deed dated 05.02.2021 in favour of HSIIDC, Haryana. It is further alleged that after receipt of the sale amount of approximately ₹15,00,000/-, the petitioner orchestrated the opening of a bank account in the name of the impersonator, in which the sale proceeds were deposited and subsequently withdrawn. As per the prosecution, the impersonator disclosed during investigation that she was paid only ₹1,00,000/- (or approximately ₹2,00,000/-, as reflected in the investigation) for impersonating Murti Devi, while the remaining amount was misappropriated by the conspirators. It is, therefore, argued that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is indispensable for unearthing the complete modus operandi of

the conspiracy, identifying the remaining beneficiaries and conspirators, tracing the flow of the defalcated amount, and effecting further recoveries.

4.1. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have meticulously perused the paper book with their able assistance.

5. Having bestowed my thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions and the material available on record, this Court finds that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave and disclose his active participation in a well-planned conspiracy involving impersonation, forgery of public documents, and fraudulent misappropriation of Government compensation. Prima facie, the petitioner, while holding the responsible office of Lambardar, allegedly identified an impostor as Murti Devi, despite the latter having expired several years prior to the execution of the impugned sale deed. The material collected during investigation further indicates that the compensation amount was deposited in a bank account allegedly opened in the name of the impersonator with the active facilitation of the petitioner, and the statement of the impersonator reveals that she received only a nominal amount for participating in the fraudulent transaction, thereby indicating that the remaining consideration was siphoned off by the principal conspirators. In such circumstances, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be imperative for unraveling the entire modus operandi of the fraud, identifying all persons involved in the conspiracy, tracing the misappropriated public funds, and conducting an effective and meaningful investigation. At this stage, this Court finds no exceptional circumstance warranting the grant of the extraordinary discretionary relief of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, without

expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition, being devoid of merit, is hereby **dismissed**.

6. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove are purely prima facie in nature and have been recorded solely for the purpose of adjudicating the present petition. Nothing contained in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case or on the truthfulness of the allegations levelled by either party. All the observations are confined to the limited scope of the present proceedings and shall neither prejudice nor influence the rights, claims, defences, or contentions of the parties during the course of investigation, trial, or any other judicial proceedings. The learned Trial Court shall consider and decide the matter strictly on the basis of the evidence adduced before it and in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observation contained in this order.

7. Consequent upon the final adjudication of the present petition, all pending miscellaneous applications, if any, arising out of or connected with the instant proceedings, shall also stand disposed of accordingly. No separate or further orders are required to be passed in respect thereof.

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

02.07.2026
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking? Yes / No

Whether reportable? Yes / No