



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

132

CRM-M-56057-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 01.10.2025

Prem Singh ... Petitioner
State of Haryana ... Respondent

Versus

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.65 dated 09.04.2025, registered under Sections 120-B, 188, 379, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC, 1860, at Police Station Chhainsa, District Faridabad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; no FIR can be lodged regarding illegal mining and only a complaint by the competent officer is maintainable; petitioner was not the person who presented the slip which was found to be forged one; there is a delay of lodging of FIR for a period of 3 years and the petitioner is not required for any custodial interrogation. Petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana puts in appearance as advance copy of petition had been served to respondent and on instructions from SI Pardeep Kumar, he has submitted that the statement of owner of



CRM-M-56057-2025 (O&M)

(2)

dumper has been recorded who has specifically stated that the present petitioner was incharge of that dumper at the relevant time. The present petitioner has produced receipt which later on was found to be forged and fabricated, and delay is on account of some complaint having been made to the Human Rights Commission and the matter was pending for the last 2 years before it. Learned State counsel further submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in 8-9 cases of illegal mining and he is required for custodial interrogation to unearth the whole *modus operandi* as to how the petitioner procured these forged and fabricated documents and also for recovery of the dumper in question.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions of learned counsel for the parties and the facts of the present case; the allegations against the present petitioner are of serious in nature; the document produced before the authorities was later on found to be forged and fabricated one on the basis of which he was initially released; the antecedents of the petitioner are not clean and clear as he is involved in several cases; and he is required for custodial interrogation. This Court finds no merits in the petition in hand, the same stands dismissed.

7. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

01.10.2025

Geeta

**(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No