

**CRM-M-11260-2025****-1-****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****103A****CRM-M-11260-2025****Date of Decision: 09.10.2025**

Parmod

...Petitioner.

v.

State of Haryana

...Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY.

Present: Mr. Pardeep Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shweta Nahata, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner, an accused, in case FIR No. 230 dated 14.10.2024, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Chhansa, Faridabad, has filed the present petition for grant of anticipatory bail

2. Relevant facts as emerging from documents on record be noticed hereinbelow:

Present criminal proceedings were initiated against the petitioner on the complaint dated 18.1.2024 lodged by Virendra Singh, son of Attar Singh, alleging therein that he owns agricultural land measuring 2 kanal 6 marlas situated in village Mohna, District Faridabad. Accused No.1 Ramveer is his distant relative. Accused No.3 being a co-villager is also known to him (complainant). Accused No.2 Attar Singh is known to both the above mentioned accused. In January, 2023, his nephew suggested a marriage proposal for him (C) and showed a photograph of the girl on



'Whatsapp'. Somehow, he started talking to the girl through his mobile. Both, accused No.1 and 2 assured him that they would help him get married to the girl and in this context, he was called at the Court premises, where he was made to affix his signatures/thumb impressions on certain papers and his photographs were also clicked. When he enquired about the girl, he did not receive any satisfactory reply, rather he was asked to wait. However, the girl did not arrive. In fact, he also did not receive any call from her. Later, he (C) was told that the girl has refused the marriage proposal. At this juncture, he demanded back the papers on which he had affixed his thumb impressions, but accused party initially denied and later refused. Complainant next alleged that on 30.1.2023, when he was working in the fields, accused No.1 stopped him and announced that now he (accused No.1) is owner of the agricultural land. He was quite shocked, further enquiries at his own level revealed that a calculated fraud had been played upon him by all the accused who acted in tandem with each other. He requested the police authorities to investigate the matter, initiate criminal proceedings against all involved and to catch hold of them. On the basis of the said complaint, a formal case vide FIR No.230 was registered on 14.10.2024. Proceedings were set into motion.

3. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner filed an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad. However, the same came to be dismissed in terms of the order dated 8.1.2025 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad, aggrieved of which, the present petition has been filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, deliberately a criminal colour



has been given to the entire incident. The fact that the FIR was lodged after much delay is itself indicative of falsity of the case set up by the complainant. Continuing further, learned counsel submits that the story put forth by the complainant when read carefully, does not appear to be logical for very conveniently complainant did not mention the name and other identification details of the girl who allegedly had been introduced to him by accused No.1. Neither did he mention her mobile number. Moreover, it appears quite strange to commonsense that on the pretext of getting married, he was asked to affix his thumb impressions on blank piece of papers and his photographs were also clicked. Learned counsel next contends that complainant had himself executed the documents and had appeared before Sub Registrar where his photographs were taken. The next leg of argument raised by learned counsel is that assuming for the sake of arguments, if the allegations levelled in the complaint are taken to be true at its face value, the only role attributed to the present petitioner is that he was merely an attesting witness to the documents, not a beneficiary. Learned counsel also submits that the presence of the petitioner is not needed for custodial interrogation as nothing is to be recovered from him. Further, after the concession of interim anticipatory bail was granted to him by this Court in terms of order dated 28.2.2025, he joined the investigation, as stands reflected from the status report, now nothing is to be recovered. Primarily with this submission, learned counsel prays that the concession of interim anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner, be confirmed.

5. At the very outset, learned State counsel submits that the status report by way of affidavit of Jitesh Kumar, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Tigaon, Faridabad filed today in Court in CRM-M-63483-2024 be



CRM-M-11260-2025

-4-

also read as reply of the State, in the present case. In para 7 thereof, it has been pointed out that the present petitioner has joined the investigation.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view of the above submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner and also taking note of the fact that the subsequent to the passing of the order dated 28.2.2025, the petitioner joined the investigation, nothing is to be recovered from him, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not needed, thus interim bail granted vide order dated 28.2.2025 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS. Further, the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by the Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner, he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

8. The petition stands allowed.

09.10.2025
gbs

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No