



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.108

CRM-M-71021-2025

Date of Decision: 09.03.2026

PAPPU

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Ankur Lal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first anticipatory bail petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 174 dated 27.07.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338 and 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) at Police Station Sadar, District Palwal, Haryana.
2. Briefly stated, the present FIR has been registered on the basis of a complaint made by Amit son of Teeka Ram alleging that one Anil son of Pappu, a resident of the same village, was involved in fraudulently facilitating the sanction of old age pensions by tampering with ration card details and manipulating income data in the Family ID records. It is alleged that the said Anil used Aadhaar cards and bank passbooks of various persons and created old age pensions for individuals who were below the eligible age of 60 years, charging amounts ranging from ₹25,000/- to ₹40,000/- for



getting a single pension approved. The complaint further alleges that he tampered with Family ID records to alter income details and eligibility and used unauthorized software tools for carrying out such fraudulent activities. It has also been alleged that old age pensions were even sanctioned for his own father and uncle despite them being ineligible. During inquiry, it surfaced that several such pensions were fraudulently obtained and some of the benefits were also taken by Pappu son of Ishri and Sunder son of Ishri, leading to registration of the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and no specific role has been attributed to him in the FIR. It is submitted that the allegations in the FIR are primarily against the son of the petitioner namely Anil, who is alleged to have manipulated the records relating to old age pension. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is an illiterate rustic villager and is not conversant with technology and, therefore, is not in a position to manipulate online records or upload documents for sanctioning of pension. It is further argued that although an amount of ₹31,650/- was credited into the bank account of the petitioner, the same was without his knowledge as he does not operate his bank account himself and usually seeks assistance of his son or other villagers for such purposes. It is also contended that the petitioner never received any OTP on his mobile phone which is mandatory for such transactions and that his mobile number may have been misused by some other person or due to a technical glitch. Learned counsel further submits that upon receiving communication from the office of the Social Welfare



Officer regarding the said pension, the petitioner immediately deposited back the amount of ₹31,650/- with the concerned department. It is also contended that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and his custodial interrogation is not required. Learned counsel further submits that the offences alleged are triable by the Court of Magistrate and the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and abide by any conditions imposed by the Court. On these grounds, prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the present petition and submitted that the investigation conducted so far has revealed the active involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence. It is contended that during investigation it has come on record that the petitioner is a direct beneficiary of the illegally sanctioned old age pension, which was obtained by manipulating official records and providing incorrect information regarding date of birth. It is further argued that the consent form and other documents bear the credentials of the petitioner and the OTP required for processing the pension was received on the mobile number linked with the petitioner, thereby indicating his knowledge and participation in the fraudulent act. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the petitioner, in connivance with co-accused, got the pension sanctioned by forging documents such as Family ID and Aadhaar details. It is further contended that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the entire chain of fraud, to identify other persons involved in facilitating such illegal sanction of pensions to ineligible



persons, and to recover forged documents and digital devices used for manipulation of records. It is thus submitted that the offences are economic in nature involving misuse of public money and therefore the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the material available on record, this Court finds that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. The material collected during investigation *prima facie* indicates that the petitioner is the beneficiary of the pension which was illegally sanctioned by manipulating the relevant records. The amount of pension was credited into the bank account of the petitioner and the documents used for sanction of pension bear the credentials linked to him. The allegations suggest that the petitioner, in connivance with other accused persons, facilitated the fraudulent sanction of pension by providing incorrect information and manipulating official records. The offences alleged involve misuse of government welfare schemes and siphoning of public funds meant for genuinely eligible beneficiaries.

6. Furthermore, the investigation is still at a crucial stage and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears necessary to uncover the entire modus operandi of the racket involved in facilitating the grant of pension to ineligible persons, to trace the financial trail and to identify other conspirators involved in the said fraudulent activity. In view of the seriousness of the allegations and the requirement of thorough investigation, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.



- 7. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
- 8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

09.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No