

2025.PHHC-105664



107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43452-2025
DECIDED ON: 18.08.2025

PURAN SINGH AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate
for the petitioners

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. **Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No. 332 dated 09.09.2024 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Shivaji Nagar, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1).

2 **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case and that they have no direct or indirect involvement in the alleged transaction. It is specifically submitted that the petitioners are neither beneficiaries nor signatories to the *Agreement to Sell* dated 12.05.2008, which pertains to a plot of land measuring 100 square yards, allegedly executed between Harbir, Abhjay, and Surjeet Singh.

It is further submitted that the petitioners have no privity of contract or any legal obligation arising out of the said agreement. Learned counsel, on their behalf, undertakes that the petitioners are ready and willing to join the investigation as and when directed by the investigating agency.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. AG. Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State, whereas Aditya Vermani, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant.

Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant opposes the prayer made in the present petition on the ground that the petitioners have signed fraudulently as witness on forged and fabricated documents for transfer of property. But he could not controvert the fact that no specific role has been assigned to the petitioners.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given due consideration to the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, and particularly taking into account the fact that the only role attributed to the petitioners is that of attesting witnesses to the will dated 12.05.2008 without any allegation of them deriving any benefit therefrom this Court is of the opinion that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioners, wherein they have *bona fide* intentions and are ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioners are directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioners do not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

18.08.2025

Meenu

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No