



2026:PHHC:072975



CRM-M-26377-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

108

CRM-M-26377-2026

Sonu and others

...Petitioners

V/s

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

Date of decision: 11.05.2026

Date of Uploading : 11.05.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kumar Yadav, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal Singla, Senior DAG Haryana.

Mr. Aman, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS/Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No.0022 dated 24.01.2024, registered under Sections 406 and 420 IPC and Sections 465, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC (added later on), at Police Station Sadar Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

The petitioners had earlier applied for grant of anticipatory bail before this Court which was dismissed on merits vide order dated on 06.04.2026.

Thereafter, the present petition i.e. the second petition for grant of anticipatory bail, has been preferred by the petitioner on 06.05.2026.

2. The prosecution case, as emanating from the FIR, is that in the month of July, 2022, the complainant was approached by the accused persons namely Sonu, Vikram @ Vikram Singh and Ankush Yadav @ Ankit (petitioners herein), who represented themselves as persons having



influence and connections in government departments and assured the complainant that they could secure him a job in the Air Force/Army/Military Engineering Service. It has been alleged that the accused persons induced the complainant to part with substantial amounts of money on the false promise of arranging government employment and also showed him purported government identity cards in order to gain his confidence. Acting upon such assurances/representations, the complainant initially transferred an amount of ₹7,50,000/- through electronic means at the instance of accused Sonu (petitioner No.1 herein). Thereafter, the accused persons allegedly sent a purported appointment letter to the complainant through electronic communication and directed him to report at Chandigarh for joining and training formalities. Believing the representations to be genuine, the complainant went to Chandigarh where he was made to stay for approximately three months under the pretext of training and departmental formalities during which he incurred additional expenses. It has been further alleged that during this period, the accused persons continued to demand additional amounts from the complainant and his family members on one pretext or the other. Certain amounts were allegedly transferred through bank accounts linked with accused Ankush Yadav (petitioner No.3) and other co-accused persons, while some payments were also made in cash. As per the complainant, the total amount alleged to have been extracted from him is approximately ₹8,00,000/-. Furthermore, the accused Vikram @ Vikram Singh (petitioner No.2) actively assured the complainant regarding the genuineness of the recruitment process and also guaranteed return of money whereas accused Ankush Yadav (petitioner No.3) facilitated the routing of funds through his



bank accounts. Accused Sonu (petitioner No.1) is alleged to be the person who initially established contact with the complainant and communicated the demands and documents pertaining to the alleged appointment process. It has been further alleged that despite repeated inquiries made by the complainant regarding issuance of joining letters and posting orders, the accused persons continued to evade him and ultimately stopped responding. Upon making inquiries from the concerned department, the complainant came to know that no such recruitment process existed and the appointment letters issued to him were forged and fabricated documents. Despite repeated demands, the accused persons (petitioners herein), allegedly failed to return the money which led to registration of the instant FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has iterated that the petitioners have falsely been implicated into the FIR in question as they are themselves the victims of the principal accused namely Anshu Yadav and Pardeep, who allegedly duped several persons on the pretext of arranging the government jobs. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioners has paid the substantial amount(s) to the accused namely Ashu and Pardeep, who have assured them of securing the government jobs. It has been further contended submitted that the petitioners have already joined the investigation on several occasions, cooperated with the Investigating Agency and supplied all documents in support of their innocence. Learned counsel has emphasized that the petitioners are neither the beneficiaries of the alleged fraud nor the masterminds and has merely acted upon the assurances extended by the principal accused. According to learned counsel, after the dismissal of the earlier anticipatory bail petitions filed by the petitioners (herein), the matter has now been amicably settled between



the parties and the complainant has already been paid the amount in question to the complainant. In this regard, learned counsel has placed reliance upon the compromise-deed(s) and affidavits appended with the petition in hand. Furthermore, the petitioners shall undertake to abide by all conditions that may be imposed by this Court, including not tampering with the prosecution evidence or influencing witnesses and not leaving the country without prior permission of the Court. Learned counsel has accordingly prayed that in view of the compromise and the conduct of the petitioners in joining the investigation, the concession of anticipatory bail deserves to be granted to the petitioners

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the petitioners by arguing that the present petition is not maintainable as it is the second petition for grant of anticipatory bail as also on merits thereof and there is no substantial change in circumstances. On merits, learned State counsel has opposed the grant of petition in hand and has submitted that the allegations against the petitioners are grave and serious in nature. Learned State counsel has iterated that the petitioners have actively participated in a well-planned conspiracy whereby unemployed youths were induced on the false promise of securing the government employment in the Air Force/Army and substantial amounts were extracted from them by using forged and fabricated appointment letters. According to learned counsel, specific roles have surfaced during the course of investigation against each of the petitioners and the money trail also reflects routing of funds through accounts connected with them. Learned State counsel has emphasized that the offences alleged against the petitioners are not merely private disputes between the individuals but constitute serious



offences involving cheating, forgery and fabrication of government documents which have wide societal ramifications. Moreover, the compromise arrived at between the parties does not dilute the gravity and seriousness of allegations involving forgery and cheating. Moreover, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is necessary to unravel the truth and no ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.2 and 3 have submitted that the parties have entered into a compromise and respondent Nos.2 and 3 have duly ratified the same.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their assistance.

7. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment passed by this Court in a titled as ***Bhisham Singh vs. State of Haryana, 2024(3) RCR(Criminal) 65***, relevant whereof reads as under:-

“11. As an epilogue to the above rumination, the following principles emerge:

I Second/successive anticipatory bail petition(s) filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., 1973 is maintainable in law & hence such petition ought not to be rejected solely on the ground of maintainability thereof.

II Such second/successive anticipatory bail petition(s) is maintainable whether earlier petition was dismissed as withdrawn/dismissed as not pressed/dismissed for non-prosecution or earlier petition was dismissed on merits.

III For the second/successive anticipatory bail petition(s) to succeed, the petitioner/applicant shall be essentially/pertinently required to show substantial change in circumstances and showing of a mere superficial or ostensible change would not suffice.

IV No exhaustive guidelines can possibly be laid down as to what would constitute substantial change in circumstances as every case has its own unique facts/circumstance. Accordingly,



this issue is best left to the judicial wisdom and discretion of the Court dealing with such second/successive anticipatory bail petition(s).

V In case a Court chooses to grant second/successive anticipatory bail petition(s), cogent and lucid reasons are pertinently required to be recorded for granting such plea despite such a plea being second/successive petition(s). In other words, the cause for a Court having successfully countenanced/entertained such second/successive petition(s) ought to be readily and clearly decipherable from the said order passed.

VI Once a plea for anticipatory bail has been dismissed as withdrawn/dismissed as not pressed/dismissed for non-prosecution or dismissed on merits by the High Court, no second/successive anticipatory bail petition(s) shall be entertained by a Sessions Court.”

8. Apart from the fact that the present petition is a second petition seeking anticipatory bail, the allegations levelled against the petitioners, as emerging from the FIR and the material collected during investigation, are indubitably serious and grave in nature. The material gathered during the course of investigation prima facie reflects that the complainant was approached by the present petitioners, namely Sonu, Vikram @ Vikram Singh and Ankush Yadav @ Ankit, in the month of July, 2022, who allegedly projected themselves as persons having influence and connections in Government departments and assured the complainant that they could secure employment for him in the Air Force/Army. Acting upon such representations and inducement, the complainant is alleged to have initially transferred an amount of Rs.7,50,000/- electronically at the instance of petitioner No.1-Sonu. Thereafter, forged and fabricated appointment letters were allegedly forwarded to the complainant and he was called to Chandigarh under the pretext of training and completion of official



formalities, where he remained for approximately three months and incurred further expenses. It is further borne out from the record that additional amounts were repeatedly demanded by the accused-petitioners from the complainant and his family members and, in this manner, an amount of approximately Rs.28,00,000/- is alleged to have been extracted from the complainant. The investigation further reveals that the funds were allegedly routed through the bank account(s) of petitioner No.3-Ankush Yadav and other co-accused persons. Petitioner No.2-Vikram @ Vikram Singh is specifically alleged to have assured the complainant regarding the genuineness of the recruitment process and also guaranteed return of the money, whereas petitioner No.1-Sonu is alleged to have initially approached the complainant, communicated with him through electronic means, demanded money and transmitted the alleged appointment letters and related documents. The investigation conducted thus far prima facie reveals that the appointment letters relied upon by the accused-petitioners were forged and fabricated and that no such recruitment process existed in the concerned Government department(s). Prima facie, the allegations disclose not merely an offence of cheating simpliciter but a well-coordinated conspiracy involving active participation of all the petitioners in inducing the complainant to part with substantial amounts of money on the false promise of securing Government employment. It is also not in dispute that the earlier anticipatory bail petition preferred by the petitioners was dismissed on merits by this Court vide order dated 06.04.2026. The present petition being a successive/second anticipatory bail petition, the petitioners are required to demonstrate a substantial change in circumstances or emergence of fresh grounds warranting reconsideration of their plea. The



principal ground now urged before this Court is that a compromise has allegedly been effected between the parties. This Court is unable to persuade itself to accept the said contention, particularly in view of the nature and gravity of the allegations involved in the present case. The accusations pertain to serious offences involving cheating, forgery and fabrication of documents purportedly issued by Government authorities. In the considered opinion of this Court, the use of forged appointment letters and false assurances of Government employment to exploit unemployed youth constitutes a grave offence having serious societal ramifications and undermines public confidence in institutional processes. Merely because the parties have subsequently entered into a compromise or certain amounts are alleged to have been repaid would not, at this stage, dilute the seriousness or gravity of the allegations. The material collected during investigation prima facie indicates active participation of the petitioners in inducing the complainant and receiving money pursuant thereto. Therefore, the conduct of the petitioners, when examined in the backdrop of the nature and severity of allegations levelled against them, disentitles them from the extraordinary discretionary relief of anticipatory bail. From the entire factual conspectus brought on record, this Court does not find any fresh ground, substantial change in circumstances or supervening circumstance so as to justify entertainment of the second anticipatory bail petition preferred by the petitioners.

9. In view of the prevenient ratiocination, it is directed as under:

(i) The petition in hand is dismissed being devoid of merits.



CRM-M-26377-2026

9

- (ii) Nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.
- (iii) Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

**(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE**

May 11, 2026
Ajay

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

