



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

CRM-M-58547-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10th September, 2025

Raj Rishi Pandey

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Farukh Abdullah, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep S. Chhina, Asst. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Amit Kumar & Mr. Gurdeep S. Nehra, Advocates
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

CRM Nos.12597 & 25272 of 2025

Allowed, as prayed for.

CRM-M-58547-2024

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS in case FIR No.653 dated 22.10.2024 under Sections 3(5), 316(2), 318(4) of BNS registered at Police Station Kundli, District Sonapat.

2. On 22.08.2025, this Court passed the following order:

“Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of affidavit of the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Rai, District Sonipat on behalf of the respondent-State, which is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that the applicant/petitioner has complied with the order dated 09.01.2025, whereby he had been directed to join investigation. In addition, it has been submitted that he has been handed over the reply just half an hour back and he would require to go through the same to make his submissions with respect to the averments made therein that the petitioner had misled the Court as well as the Investigating Officer with respect to his residential address.

Learned State counsel, in addition to the averments made in the affidavit, on instructions, has submitted that certain material facts including cancellation notice dated 03.04.2024 had not been brought to the notice of this Court and it was on account of material concealment and twisted facts that the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 22.11.2024 extended the concession of interim bail to the applicant/petitioner. Learned State counsel submits that the custodial interrogation of the applicant/ petitioner would be necessitated in view of the specific and serious allegations levelled against him... ..”

3. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer of the petitioner for extending the concession of anticipatory bail to him on the following grounds:

- (i) The petitioner has, at every stage, attempted to mislead the Court and the Investigating Agency by furnishing fictitious residential addresses.
- (ii) Interim bail was granted to him on 22.11.2024 in CRM-58547-2024, only because of a false affidavit dated 19.11.2024, wherein an address was given which, on

verification turned out to be a Government quarter occupied by one Smt. Mukesh Devi and her husband, who had no connection whatsoever with the petitioner.

(iii) In CRM-12597-2025, the petitioner again relied upon fabricated documents – a rent agreement and a voter ID card of one Smt. Sajeena Begum. On verification, it was established by the Municipal Council, Loni, and the Election Officer, Ghaziabad that neither the address existed nor did the voter ID have any validity in official records.

(iv) The petitioner has thus played a fraud upon the Court, secured interim protection by misrepresentation, has not recovered the defrauded amount of ₹5,00,000/- and has been consistently non-cooperative in the investigation.

4. A prayer has, therefore, been made for dismissal of the instant petition as learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required since there is a strong likelihood of his involvement in the fabrication of Aadhaar Cards/Voter ID Cards etc. and he being a part of a larger gang involved in such like crimes.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, on the other hand, has argued that the petitioner duly complied with the order of this Court dated 09.01.2025 by joining the investigation on 20.01.2025. Learned counsel asserted that the allegation of false addresses is unfounded. The petitioner had provided genuine addresses, but due to

police intimidation, the occupants – who are his relatives – disowned any association with him.

6. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has now placed on record his correct residential particulars supported by documents including a voter ID card annexed as Annexure P-7 and 8. It has also been submitted that the petitioner is a law-abiding citizen, has social roots, and is ready to cooperate with the investigation. Denial of anticipatory bail, in such circumstances, would amount to undue hardship, despite his willingness to face the process of law.

7. The reply by way of affidavit of Vipin Kumar Ahlawat, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Rai, District Sonipat dated 22.08.2025, filed by sets out the following facts:

- The complainant Jaiveer alleged that the petitioner and one Harsh Pandey induced him to part with ₹ 5,00,000/- under the false pretext of selling shops which were never owned by them, and later issued threats to him and his family. FIR No.653 dated 22.10.2024 was accordingly registered under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 3(5) of BNS at Police Station Kundli, District Sonapat.
- The petitioner's earlier application for anticipatory bail was dismissed on 14.11.2024 by the learned Sessions Court Sonipat.
- Despite directions of this Court, the petitioner's cooperation in the investigation was perfunctory.

- The defrauded sum has not yet been recovered.
- Verification of addresses at Pitampura (Delhi), Gol Market (Delhi) and Naipura, Loni (Ghaziabad), all conclusively established that the petitioner was never residing there. Reports of the Municipal Council, the Election Officer and local Ward authorities have confirmed that the documents relied upon by the petitioner were non-existent and forged.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

9. The allegations against the petitioner *prima facie* are grave and supported by specific details, including bank transactions and contemporaneous receipts. The petitioner has, on more than one occasion, furnished false addresses and fabricated documents in judicial proceedings. These acts are not accidental or technical lapses, but evidently deliberate and calculated attempts to mislead both the Investigating Agency and this Court.

10. The plea that relatives disowned him due to police intimidation, stands falsified by the categorical reports of police which exposed the documents as forged and the addresses as non-existent.

11. The petitioner apparently obtained interim bail from this Court on 22.11.2024 through deliberate concealment of material facts and submission of a false affidavit. This amounts to playing fraud upon the Court.

12. A litigant who approaches the Court with unclean hands, suppresses facts and obstructs investigation by deceit, cannot claim the equitable relief of anticipatory bail.

13. Before parting, it must be noted that the conduct of the petitioner reflects a conscious and continuing design to abuse the process of law. Furnishing false affidavits, producing fabricated documents, and misleading the Court are serious transgressions that strike at the very root of Judicial integrity. This Court cannot permit itself to become a forum for manipulation. Such conduct not only disentitles the petitioner to any discretionary relief, but also warrants strict consequences in accordance with law, should such attempts be repeated in future.

14. In light of the gravity of the allegations, the deliberate misrepresentation by the petitioner, and his persistent non-cooperation, no ground is made out to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

September 10, 2025

rps

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