



254

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

**CRM-M-33308-2025****Date of Decision:07.07.2025**

Vicky Sood

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Nikhil Chopra, Advocate with  
Mr. Shubham, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. N.C.Kinra, Advocate and  
Mr. Harsh Kinra, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No.03 dated 06.01.2025 registered under Sections 406, 420 of IPC, at Police Station Focal Point, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had started his business under the name and style of M/s Mahajan Steel Furniture Ltd. in the year 2012 and he was the only Director along with his other family members. Learned counsel further contends that later on, the petitioner suffered business losses and the complainant approached him to purchase the business and the factory. Thereafter, an agreement to sell was executed between the parties in the year 2016 and the complainant had agreed to purchase the property for a sum of Rs.4.90 crores, vide agreement to sell (Annexure P-1).

After execution of the agreement to sell, the possession of the property was handed over to the complainant and since then, he is running the affairs of the factory as well as business and is having the complete control over the business. Later on, in the year 2018, the complainant and his wife also became Directors of the firm and after 2018, the petitioner had no concern with the affairs of M/s Mahajan Steel Furniture Ltd. Learned counsel further submits that for the execution of sale deed, the complainant had liberty of approaches the Civil Court, but instead of availing a civil remedy, he got the FIR registered against the petitioner by concocting a false story. In fact, a civil dispute has been illegally converted into a criminal offence and the petitioner was wrongly arrested on 24.05.2025.

3. On the other hand, status report has been filed by learned State counsel in Court today and the same is taken on record. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has committed a fraud with the complainant and does not deserve the concession of bail. However, learned State counsel submits that the documentary evidence has already been collected by the police in the present case.

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

5. In the present case, the entire controversy is centered around an agreement, which was allegedly executed between the parties in the year 2016 and the last date for execution of the sale deed was 10.12.2016. In the present case, the possession is admittedly with the complainant side and the prosecution

is yet to lead evidence to prove the ingredient of offence against the petitioner. At this stage, the petitioner is stated to be in custody since 24.05.2025 and the case is primarily based on documentary evidence, which has already been recovered by the police during investigation.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

**07.07.2025**  
hemlata

**(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

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