



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

CRM-M-11456-2025

Date of Decision: 22.04.2025

Bhagmal

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

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

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Pardeep Chhoker, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.166, dated 19.04.2024, under Sections 420,406 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Model Town Rewari, District Rewari, Haryana (Annexure P-1).
2. While granting the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court on 10.03.2025, this Court had noticed the following contentions:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by the police with an oblique motive. In fact, during the year 2011-12, the petitioner had borrowed a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- from the complainant on the occasion of marriage of his sons and the complainant had obtained signatures/thumb impressions of the petitioner on the blank papers on the pretext of preparing a receipt; however, the papers were later on misused by the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the transaction details (Annexure P-2) to contend that an amount of Rs.3,00,000/- was returned by the petitioner in the account of Khub Ram, son of the complainant. Still further, the petitioner returned an amount of Rs.8,00,000/- in total to the complainant and his son and this clearly shows that the signatures/thumb impressions of the petitioner have been misused by the complainant. He further contends that the petitioner had also moved a complaint bearing No.33-PSP dated 03.01.2024 to the Superintendent of Police, Rewari (Annexure P-4), but no action was taken against the complainant. He further contends that the petitioner had never entered into an agreement to sell with the complainant and the allegations levelled by the complainant are highly unbelievable and improbable. He further contends that the case is based on documentary evidence and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required”.

3. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the submissions and submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation.

4. Learned State counsel also submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation and is no longer required for further investigation.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner was the owner of only 06 *kanals* of land and at the time of commission of crime and had committed a fraud with the complainant in the present case.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

7. In the present case, it is not in dispute that the petitioner has

already joined the investigation and the documentary evidence has already been collected by the police. Even as per the statement made by learned State counsel, the petitioner is no longer required for further investigation.

8. In view of the above, the interim order dated 10.03.2025 is made absolute. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation, as and when called by the Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

22.04.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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