

S. No.202

2025:PHHC:105497



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

**CRM-M-37412 of 2025
Date of Decision:13.08.2025**

Varun Puri

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present:- Mr. Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate and Mr. R.S. Bagga,
Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.398 dated 29.11.2018 under Sections 406/420/120-B of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Kherki Daula, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1).

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR emanates from a builder buyer dispute wherein the complainant purchased a flat No.1703, Tower-G, Universal Aura, Sector-82, Gurugram being developed by Universal Buildwell Pvt. Ltd. from the first buyer PNP Probuild Pvt. Ltd. vide confirmation of ownership dated 12.01.2013. The allegations in the aforesaid FIR are qua alleged violation of the terms of the Licence No.51/2011 dated 05.06.2011 being valid up to 04.06.2015 issued in favour of M/s Shiv Ganesh Buildcon Pvt. Ltd. such as advertisement for sale prior to approval of the building plan, excessive charges



levied by UBPL as external and internal development charges and charges levied qua car parking etc. It is further alleged that the complainant had already paid Rs.55,98,698/- to the accused company but till date, complainant has not received the possession of the unit. The complainant made a complaint dated 03.08.2017 before the concerned SHO but no action has been taken. Thus, he approached the Ld. JMIC, Gurugram under Section 156(3) Cr.PC and vide order dated 04.09.2018 (Annexure P-6) passed in COMI No.481/2017 directions were issued by the concerned Court to the SHO, PS Khedki Daula, Gurugram to register the FIR. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and the challan was presented. On framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 14.05.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, which is purely of a civil nature. He submits that the petitioner is a builder but he is not the signatory of the confirmation of ownership dated 12.10.2012 executed in favour of the complainant. He signed the above mentioned builder buyer agreement with the first buyer in his capacity as the Authorized Signatory of the UBPL and he was not the director of UBPL at the relevant time. He submits that proceedings before the NCLT, Delhi commenced. Resolution Professional was appointed and assets were



taken over. He submits that though the petitioner is facing prosecution in 64 FIRs, however, he has emphasized that in a similarly situated case i.e. CRM-M-37287-2025 the petitioner has been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 08.08.2025. Copy of the order has been placed on record. He, thus, submits that in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who is involved in other 67 cases. It is submitted that the petitioner was declared Proclaimed Offender in the year 2021. On instructions, he submits that the investigation is complete and challan has been presented. However, charges are yet to be framed.

5. Learned Senior counsel at this stage submits that petitioner has been granted bail in the case wherein he was declared P.O.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 07.03.2025. In similarly situated cases i.e. CRM-M-37287-2025, CRM-M-37558 of 2025 and CRM-M-37564 of 2025, the petitioner has already been granted concession of regular bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide orders dated 08.08.2025 and 11.08.2025. From the perusal of the same, it is apparent that the matter in the present case also pertains to the similar issue. It is informed that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 05 months & 02 days as on 08.08.2025.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting



anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner is entitled for grant of regular bail.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned Trial Court, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not misuse the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqha Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.
- (viii) The petitioner shall submit, on the first working day of every month, an affidavit, before the concerned trial Court, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In case the petitioner is found to be involved in any



offence after his being enlarged on bail in the present FIR, on the basis of his affidavit or otherwise, the State is mandated to move, forthwith, for cancellation of his bail which plea, but of course, shall be ratiocinated upon merits thereof.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

August 13, 2025
renu

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No