



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

210

CRM-M No.28704 of 2025

Date of decision : 03.07.2025

Mukim Khan

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.. Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate with  
Mr. Rahul Gugnani and  
Mr. Abhinav Kaushik, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate with  
Mr. Karan Kamboj, Advocate and  
Ms. Preet Komal, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.410 dated 08.06.2022 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Sector-8, Faridabad.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused has forged the documents of the complainant and his son including Aadhar Card, PAN card and other documents and had obtained bank loan of Rs.20 lakhs against his agricultural land from Finance Induja Leyland.

2. In compliance to the order dated 23.05.2025 passed by this Court, status report by way of an affidavit of Mahesh Kumar, H.P.S., Assistant Commissioner of Police, Ballabgarh Zone, Faridabad on behalf of respondent-



State has been filed which is taken on record.

3. I have perused and gone through the reply so filed whereby it is stated that the petitioner alongwith co-accused has committed forgery by using ID proofs of the complainant as well as his son Jamshed and had obtained Rs.68 lakhs from different banks.

4. Learned counsel for the State opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the allegations made against the petitioner are grave in nature and prays for dismissal of the anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for both the parties and have considered the allegations against the petitioner.

6. In view of the reply so filed, this Court is of the view that the allegations involved in the present case are serious in nature and as such, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail. Therefore, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**July 03, 2025**

*Sonia Puri*

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No