

111

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36580-2025
Date of decision: 14.07.2025

Varsha Chugh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Shubham Jha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, D.A.G., Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Offenses	Police Station
0020	21.01.2022	120-B, 34, 406, 420 IPC	City Bahadurgarh

1. Seeking cancellation of bail granted to respondents No.3 to 6 in the FIR captioned above, the petitioner has come up before this Court under Section 483(3) r/w 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS].
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that complainant is senior citizen and the disputed property was sold without making payment of balance amount to the petitioner as agreed by the respondents. He further submits that the respondents are forging multiple documents, as such bail should be cancelled. Counsel further submits that period of 02 years has already elapsed and payment is yet to be made to her.
3. Perusal of the order vide which bail was granted shows that petitioner compromised the matter and an amount of Rs.25 lacs has already been paid to the petitioner and a cheque of Rs.2.5 lacs was also given out of the agreed amount of Rs.50 lacs. When complainant agreed to compromise and taken the payment and private respondents were granted bail, this Court could not be party to their agreement. It was for the petitioner to compromise or not and ensure her interest. Moreover, bail was never granted solely on any such concession and was also granted on merits and the reasons mentioned by the complainant are not legally sustainable. Hence, the petition is not worth issuing notice.



4. Given above, the present petition is dismissed. All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

14.07.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.