



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

311

CRM-M No.12306 of 2025
Date of decision: 20.03.2025

Satpal Singh ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Himanshu Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
10	30.01.2025	City Zira, District Ferozepur	319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”)

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis

2025:PHHC:038578



of a complaint lodged by the complainant Bogha Singh alleging therein that he was interested to buy some chunk of land and had approached the present petitioner, who is a property dealer by profession in the month of August 2024, for this purpose. The petitioner had subsequently called him for effecting deal qua purchase of some property. On 30.09.2024, the complainant along with his son Jaswinder Singh had gone to the office of the petitioner wherein he along with the co-accused Sukhdev Singh and Satnam Singh was found present. They introduced the complainant with a female sitting therein as Rupinder Kaur wife of Inderjit Singh, resident of Village Balkhandi and representing to him that the said Rupinder Kaur owned 68 Kanal 1 Marla of land in the area of Village Attari and interested to sell the same. The petitioner got effected a deal of purchase of land of the said Rupinder Kaur. The sale consideration amount was agreed to be paid @ Rs.30,25,000/- per acre. On asking of the petitioner and the co-accused Sukhdev Singh and Satnam Singh, the complainant gave a sum of Rs.20 lakhs in cash on 04.10.2024 to the aforementioned Rupinder Kaur and cheque for an amount of Rs.9,50,000/- was given to her by way of earnest money. A written agreement to sell was executed on the same day which was signed by the petitioner, co-accused Sukhdev Singh and Satnam Singh as well as by the female who claimed herself to be Rupinder Kaur. Prior to the registration of the sale deed, the complainant came to know that a fraud was being played upon him and

2025:PHHC:038578



the petitioner as well as the co-accused by impersonating some other female as Rupinder Kaur, had duped him of aforementioned amount of money and infact the original Rupinder Kaur was not interested to sell her property. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre arrest bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Ferozepur vide order dated 18.02.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The dispute is of civil nature. There is delay of three and half months in reporting the matter to the police which has not been explained. He is not beneficiary to the transaction. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. He is ready to join the investigation. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who by hatching a conspiracy with the co-accused induced the complainant to enter into an agreement to purchase some land owned by one Rupinder Kaur who by impersonating the said Rupinder Kaur and by producing some other female, the petitioner and

2025:PHHC:038578



the co-accused extracted cash amount of Rs.20 lakhs and cheque for a sum of Rs.9,50,000/- from the complainant though the said cheque has been returned by accused Sukhdev Singh to the complainant after few days of execution of agreement. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for conducting thorough investigation in the matter, for tracing out the whereabouts of the female who impersonated herself as Rupinder Kaur and also for eliciting information as to the manner in which the conspiracy was hatched by the petitioner. No extraordinary and exceptional circumstance for grant of pre arrest bail is made out. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record.

6. The petitioner who is property dealer by profession, by hatching a conspiracy with the co-accused to cheat the complainant, is alleged to have induced him to enter into an agreement to purchase some property represented to be belonging to one Rupinder Kaur and on that pretext, an amount of Rs.20 lakhs in cash and cheque of Rs.9,50,000/- had been taken by the petitioner and the co-accused from the complainant. Though the said cheque had been returned but wrongful loss to the tune of Rs.20 lakhs had been caused to the complainant. The allegations against the petitioner are specific and serious in nature. The case is at its nascent stage. For conducting thorough investigation in the



matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is well settled that the custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order of anticipatory bail. Moreso, in the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.03.2025	(MANISHA BATRA)
manju	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No