



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

216

**CRM-M-28512-2025
Decided on : 07.08.2025**

Anoop Parashar and another . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Aman Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. PK Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Anoop Parashar and Tarun Kumar	324	05.07.2018	420/467/468/471/34 of IPC	Sadar Ballabgarh	Faridabad

2. On 22.05.2025, following order was passed:-

"1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Anoop Parashar and Tarun Kumar	324	05.07.2018	420/ 467/ 468/ 471/ 34 of IPC	Sadar Ballabgarh	Faridabad

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends, inter alia, that FIR in the present case was registered, way back in the month of July, 2018. He submits that the matter pertains purely to a civil dispute, devoid of any element of



criminality. Despite the petitioner being available and accessible throughout this period, the police neither approached him for investigation nor made any attempt to arrest him.

3. *It is further argued that during the pendency of the anticipatory bail application filed by the petitioner before learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, investigating agency submitted a reply. In that reply, it was specifically admitted that no forgery was found to have been committed by either of the petitioners, as the specimen signatures did not match the disputed signatures. Counsel also submits that the entire dispute revolves around a monetary amount of Rs.14,70,000/-.*

4. *Additionally, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 was indeed a Director of Soalni Healthcare Private Limited, but only for a limited period from 21.11.2016 to 15.06.2017. He had subsequently resigned from the directorship due to internal departmental issues. Similarly, it is contended that petitioner No.2 has no connection whatsoever with the complainant or the alleged firm involved in the dispute. He is employed in an entirely different field and has no role in the matter.*

5. *In view of these facts, counsel argues that once the prosecuting agency, including the police, found no incriminating material against the petitioners, and this fact had been brought to the notice of the court also, there was no justification for the dismissal of the anticipatory bail application by the said court.*

6. *Counsel for the petitioners also submits that both the petitioners are ready to join the investigation, if they are protected from arrest by this Court. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the present case.*

7. *Notice of motion.*

8. *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

9. *Adjourned to 07.08.2025.*

10. *In the meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, the petitioners shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

11. *Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during



trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in compliance of the order dated 22.05.2025, passed by this Court, petitioners have joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by learned counsel for the petitioners of joining the investigation on 19.07.2025, by the petitioners, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioners have already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 22.05.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

7. **Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.**

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

August 07, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No