



2026:PHHC:076375

2026:PHHC:076375

CRM-M-20981-2026

1



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

Sr.No.205

**CRM-M-20981-2026
Decided on : 14.05.2026**

Shiva

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present : Mr. Sahil Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.20 dated 14.02.2026, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, at Police Station Sector 7, Panchkula.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner alongwith co-accused prepared forged experience certificate by forging the signatures and stamp of District Programme Officer. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are false and he has no concern with the said offence. Learned counsel contends that the present FIR is counter-blast to the FIR registered by the father of the petitioner against the officials of the department. He further contends that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner and there is nothing on



record to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner, and his custodial interrogation is not required. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the Investigating Agency and shall fully cooperate with the investigation. On these grounds, it is prayed that the present petition be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel while referring to the status report already filed, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He contends that the forged certificate was provided to candidate Shabana by charging a sum of Rs.12,000/- and the signatures on the said certificate are of the petitioner, therefore, he is required for custodial interrogation to find out as to how he had prepared forged certificate, forged signatures and stamp of Programme Officer and misused the same. Further, during investigation, statement of one witness namely Shinam (Para Legal Worker) was also recorded against the petitioner and co-accused. Thus, the petitioner does not deserve any concession from this Court.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record, it is evident that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature as he had forged certificate in lieu of monetary benefit. It is still to be investigated as to how the petitioner prepared forged signatures and stamp of Programme Officer and misused the same. Further, during investigation, statement of one witness namely Shinam (Para Legal Worker) was also recorded against the petitioner and co-accused. Serious allegations of cheating involving a substantial amount have been levelled against the petitioner. Grant of anticipatory bail in such



circumstances would not only impede effective investigation but may also embolden similar fraudulent activities. This Court is sanguine of the fact that while considering the petition for anticipatory bail, it is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusation against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine and seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

6. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would



reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in case titled as ***"P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement"***, (2019) 9 SCC 24, while dealing with economic offences, has held that the power of anticipatory bail should be sparingly exercised in economic offences. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

"77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar, the Supreme Court held as under: (SCC p.386, para 19)

"19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enrope in the crime and would not misuse his liberty".

Economic Offences

78. *Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain, it was held that in economic offences, the accuse is not entitled to anticipatory bail.*



2026:PHHC:076375

2026:PHHC:076375

CRM-M-20981-2026

5



XXX XXX XXX

83. *Grant of anticipatory bail at the stage of investigation may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and also the materials which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused knows that he is protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the effective investigation. Having regard to the materials said to have been collected by the respondent Enforcement Directorate and considering the stage of the investigation, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail”.*

8. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

9. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.

14.05.2026
mamta

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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