

2025.PHHC:034005



108

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

**CRM-M-13489-2025  
DECIDED ON: 11.03.2025**

**SUKHDEV SINGH**

**....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Daljeet Singh Virk, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG Haryana

Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the complainant.

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**

**1. Relief sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0038, dated 29.01.2025, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Line Sirsa, District Sirsa (Annexure P-1).

2. Brief Facts of the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

*“Briefly stated, complaint No.5786-P.U. dated 02.11.2024 moved by complainant Indrawati wife of Shriram son Bhalle Ram resident of village Kotli Tehsil and District Sirsa against Sukhdev Singh and Jangir Singh sons of Pyara Singh, residents of village Kotli Tehsil and District Sirsa etc. addressed to the*

*Superintendent of Police, Sirsa was received in the Police Station for taking legal action against 1. Sukhdev Singh (applicant) son of Shri Pyara Singh son of Shri Narayan Singh 2. Jangir son of Shri Pyara Singh son of Shri Narayan Singh, residents of village Kotli Tehsil and District Sirsa wherein it is mentioned that the culprits have cheated the complainant of land in village Kotli, Khewat No. 686, Khatoni No.770 and 771, total kittas 19, 79/4996 share of total area 124 Kanal 18 Marlas Regarding sale of area 1 Kanal 19.5 Marla and in this regard sale deed no. 4099 dated 08.09.2016 was registered in favour of the complainant in the office Registrar/Tehsildar Sirsa after collecting Rs.9,00,000/- and the possession of 1 Kanal 19.5 Marla was handed over to the complainant, on which she has been cultivating till date. Now the accused are telling the complainant to leave this agricultural land or else they will kill her. When the complainant said that the land belongs to her then the accused started saying that you have no ownership right on this land, the sale deed executed in your favour was forged and wrong and we got it done in connivance with the registrar and other employees to grab money from you. Thereafter when the complainant made an enquiry at her own level then she came to know that as per the revenue records there was a total of 15 Kanal 12 Marla land in the name of accused No.1, out of which accused No. 1 sold his 45/1249 share i.e. 4 Kanal 10 Marla land from the above mentioned land vide Mutation No.4713 to Bimla Devi wife of Kashmir Chand son of Shri Bagram on 06.05.2014. Thereafter accused No.1 sold 4 Kanals of land being 40/1249 share to Indrawati (complainant) wife of Ramniwas son of Balle Ram on 16.10.2015 vide mutation no.4897 and thereafter sold 7 Kanals 2 Marlas of land being 71/1249 share to Kalawati wife of Leelu Ram son of Harpat resident of Kanwarpura District Sirsa on 08.01.2016 vide mutation no.4918. In this manner accused No.1 had already sold all his land and he was well aware of this fact but still the accused with the intention of cheating the complainant and*

*usurping the money sold the above land to the complainant and got the same registered in the name of the complainant. While getting this sale deed executed, the accused took Rs.27,000/- as stamp duty, Rs.9,00,000/- as the price of the land and Rs.15,000/- as other expenses from the complainant. Thus, the accused have cheated the complainant of a total amount of Rs.9,42,000/-. In this regard, the complainant had earlier moved an application number 4516-PU dated 24.08.2024 to the Superintendent of Police, Sirsa and an application diary no.4964-PU dated 13.09.2024 to the Superintendent of Police, Sirsa, but no legal action has been taken till date. Therefore, she requested to take strict legal action against the culprits. Hence the present FIR was registered.”*

3. **Contention**

**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner has already joined the inquiry proceedings initiated by the police and produced the relevant documents. He asserts that the case is based on the documentary evidence, which the Investigating Agency has already recovered from the petitioner and Revenue Department.

**On behalf of the State/complainant**

Learned State Counsel, assisted by Learned Counsel for the Complainant, prays for the dismissal of the present petition, submitting that the petitioner has intentionally defrauded the complainant by selling the subject land, notwithstanding the fact that the land had already been conveyed to the complainant and other parties, and the petitioner had no legal ownership or entitlement to the said property.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given a considerable thought to the submissions made hereinabove especially to the fact that complaint stands registered after delay of 9 years of registration of sale deed dated 08.09.2016 and the case revolves around documentary evidence and the documents which are to be examined by the Investigating Officer can be either extracted at the time when the petitioner joins the investigation or from the Revenue Department.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein he has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

5. **Relief**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

*‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*

*(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*

*(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts*

*of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*

*(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*

*(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'*

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)**  
**JUDGE**

**11.03.2025**

*Meenu*

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>