

CRM-M-33637 of 2026(O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:089841



CRM-M-33637 of 2026(O&M)  
Date of Order:03.07.2026

**Akshay Sharma**

**..Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana**

**..Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

**Present:** Mr. Saurav Kanojia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

**SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J. (oral)**

Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case vide FIR No. 35 dated 03.02.2026, under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340, 61(2) of BNS at Police Station Gandhi Nagar, Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar. This is the first application for anticipatory bail.

2. Complainant Raj Kumar Singh Manager, The Yamuna Nagar District Co-operative Labour and Construction Federation Ltd. alleged in the complaint that petitioner Akshay Kumar was working as Data Entry operator in the Federation and was looking after the office work including maintenance of record. In June 2005, during the course of audit, it was revealed that Akshay Kumar forged the signatures of Manager Raj Kumar and Director Rajbir Singh and withdrew and embezzled Rs.10,08,200/- from the office savings account from July 2024 to May 2025, though he was

**CRM-M-33637 of 2026(O&M)**

aware that tenure of the Directors had expired on 15.09.2024. On notice served, he deposited an amount of Rs.1,50,000/- in the account and also admitted his guilt. He gave a cheque of Rs.4,80,000/- of his mother as part payment of the amount. Later it was also revealed that he had embezzled amount from the account No.520101246465571 of the Federation with Union Bank of India lying dormant since long.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was innocent and had been falsely implicated. He was merely a Data Entry Operator in the Yamuna Nagar District Co-operative Labour and Construction Federation Ltd. Yamuna Nagar and worked under the directions of the Manager-Harvinder Singh. Petitioner was not in possession and custody of the cheque book nor had signed the cheques. The allegation that he had deposited Rs. 1,50,000/- in the official account was also false and baseless. Infact, Manager/complainant was on family terms with the petitioner and had misused the cheque of Rs.4,80,000/- issued by his mother. Antecedents of the petitioner were clean and he was ready and willing to join investigation.

4. Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of affidavit of Rajat Gulia, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar and has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail submitting that petitioner was entrusted with the custody of record and operation of office work. He forged the signatures of office bearers on the cheques, manipulated bankings records, withdrew office funds without authority, misappropriated public/cooperative funds and subsequently attempted to conceal the fraud by making partial deposits and issuing a cheque, which was dishonoured with

**CRM-M-33637 of 2026(O&M)**

the remarks “insufficient funds”. It was urged that custodial interrogation of the petitioner was required for recovery of documents relating to the fraudulent transactions, forged record electronic data and to interrogate the role of petitioner. Learned State counsel further refers to Annexure R-3 statement of the petitioner recorded in the preliminary inquiry wherein he conceded that he has been misled into committing fraud and was pressurised by certain individual to carry out the task and was ready to return the money he received.

5. Allegations against the petitioner are grave, serious and specific. His custodial interrogation is required for effecting recoveries relating to the alleged fraudulent transactions. There are no extra ordinary circumstances made out to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail. Considering the nature and substance of allegations against the petitioner; the role attributed to him, quantum of punishment conviction may entail and all relevant facts and circumstances of the case, it is not a fit case to release petitioner on anticipatory bail. Grant of anticipatory bail at this stage will not advance the course of justice and would amount to undue interference in the statutory investigational powers of the police, which is not permissible.

6. Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

**(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**03.07.2026**

reema	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No