

2025:PHHC:132829



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

208

**CRM-M No.40372 of 2025  
Date of decision: 23.09.2025**

Firoz alias Firoj Khan

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Ms. Sapna Lather, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,  
for the respondent-State.

----

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**

1. The present one is the second petition as filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") for grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.1465 dated 27.09.2023 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Idrish alleging therein that he was

2025:PHHC:132829



a specially abled person belonging to a very poor family and was looking after his family members with his disability pension only. About six months back, he came into contact with accused Praveen who introduced him with accused Narender, both of whom represented to him that they could get secured loan to the tune of Rs.50,000/- under some scheme floated by the Government. They also allured him to deposit a sum of Rs.25,000/- at the outset and also showed that he would be exempted from making re-payment of the said loan amount. On being induced by him, the complainant gave a sum of Rs.25,000/- to the accused Narender and Praveen. Not even this, on being so induced, they had told about the Government scheme to other females living in the neighbourhood who too deposited money with the accused Praveen and Narender. As such, a sum of Rs.12,000/- in toto had been deposited by them. Both of them told the complainant and others to wait for ten days. However, neither any loan was given to them nor they received any money. Rather he came to know that the accused Narender and Praveen in connivance with accused Firoz i.e. the present petitioner and Mehtab who was an employee of Ujjiwan Bank, had shown the wife of the complainant as a group head and had secured loan of a sum of Rs.3 lakhs from Ujjiwan Finance Bank in the names of each of them and since re-payment of the loan amount was not made, therefore, their houses and other articles could be attached.

2025:PHHC:132829



By alleging that the petitioner and the co-accused had cheated him and other victims, he prayed for taking action.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The accused Mehtab was arrested on 10.12.2023. The accused Narender was arrested on 11.12.2023 whereas the accused Praveen was arrested on 27.01.2024. Investigation qua them stands completed and challan has been presented. The present petitioner was alleged to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused Mehtab to dupe poor persons. Apprehending his arrest, he moved an application for pre arrest bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panipat vide order dated 27.03.2024. He previously moved petition bearing CRM-M No.23712 of 2024 seeking pre arrest bail. He was asked to join investigation but did not join the same and, therefore, the said petition was dismissed for non-prosecution vide order dated 10.03.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. His custodial interrogation is not required. He is ready to join the investigation. No recovery is to be effected from him. The co-accused Praveen has been extended benefit of anticipatory bail whereas accused Narender and Mehtab have been extended benefit of regular bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves

2025:PHHC:132829



to be allowed.

5. Status report has been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. No ground for grant of pre arrest bail is made out against the petitioner as his custodial interrogation is must for conducting thorough investigation in the matter and to ascertain the role exactly played by the petitioner. It is, therefore, urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy to cheat the complainant and other victims and in pursuance thereof, the co-accused and himself had extracted money from the victims and the same was converted to their own use thereby causing loss to the victims. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. In case, the same is denied to the investigation agency, that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, adversely affecting the investigation. In the present case, no exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove

2025:PHHC:132829



shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**23.09.2025**

manju

**(MANISHA BATRA)**

**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No