

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

CRM-M-44866-2025  
Reserved on: 02.09.2025  
Pronounced on: 16.09.2025

Raj Kumar @ Raj Kumar Solanki ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Prateek Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, A.A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
213	26.08.2024	City Dadri, District Charkhi Dadri	120-B, 467, 468, 471 IPC

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
2. Per paragraph 14 of the reply, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

*“2. That brief facts in the matter are that a case FIR No. 213 dated 26.08.2024 under sections 420/467/468/471/120-B IPC PS City Dadri was registered on the complaint of Pinki daughter of Hoshiar Singh resident of village Kheri Batter district Charkhi Dadri stating inter-alia therein that they have land inside Lal Dora in village Kheri Batter and she and her mother Sunita are co-sharer of the same. Her father Hoshiar Singh has expired on 22.12.2021. That land measuring 10 Kanal and house of her deceased father was sold by her brother Ravinder @ Mohit and his wife Komal through two sale-deeds dated 19.09.2023 and 26.02.2024 for which payment of Rs. 3,80,000/- was received through cheque dated 05.02.2024 from one Sharmila wife of Satyawar for 2 Kanal 1.82 Marla land and land measuring 7 Kanal 19 Maria was sold to Parmila, Sarpanch of the village, for which payment was received through cheque dated 18.09.2023. In this regard accused Komal stood as attesting-witness in release-deed No.6449 dated*

*5.2.2024 executed in favour of accused Ravinder to succeed the ownership exclusively from her father Hoshiyar Singh, who had died on 22.12.2021 leaving behind widow Sunita @Guddi, daughter Pinki (complainants) and accused/brother Ravinder as son. The complainant further stated that her deceased father Hoshiyar Singh was fraudulently and deceitfully shown as alive to cheat the complainant and her mother and entire agriculture land and residential house running in the name of deceased Hoshiyar Singh were fraudulently usurped and were sold subsequently to some third persons by accused Komal and her husband Ravinder.”*

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

7. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

*“ROLE OF THE PETITIONER*

*10. That role of the petitioner is that accused Ravinder in collusion with petitioner/accused Raj Kumar Solanki, despite having knowledge that Hoshiyar Singh (Father of Ravinder) has already expired two years back i.e. on 22.11.2021, participated in the sinister deal and got the land transferred fraudulently in his name by way of 03 transfer deeds wherein petitioner/accused Raj Kumar was impersonating himself as Hoshiyar Singh at the time of execution of these transfer-deeds. Accused Ravinder paid Rs. 4500/- to the petitioner for these fraudulent deeds.”*

8. There is sufficient prima facie evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. Per paragraph 14 of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 13.02.2025. Per the custody certificate dated 01.09.2025, the petitioner's total custody in this FIR is 06 months and 18 days. Given the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

9. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

10. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

11. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

12. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms.

13. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case, or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

14. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

**15. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.**

16. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

CRM-M-44866-2025

17. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

18. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

16.09.2025  
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.