



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

220

CRM-M-44203-2025

Date of decision : 06.11.2025

BUDH RAM YADAV ALIAS AJAY KUMAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Dr. Anand K. Bishnoi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

Subhas Mehla, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. and 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.363 dated 20.11.2024 under Sections 471, 468, 467, 420, 120-B and 419 (added later on) IPC, registered at Police Station Sector-56, District Gurugram, Haryana.

2. The facts of the present case are that the present FIR has been lodged by complainant Aman Goyal by moving written complaint against Randeep Raj Boora, Kamal Kumar, Kishor Kumar, Mohd. Salman, Goldi alleging therein that he had entered into an agreement on 10-04-2023 to purchase a plot of land measuring 907 square yards in Village Wazirabad, Tehsil Wazirabad, Gurgaon. The agreement was made through Randeep Raj Boora's General Power of Attorney (GPA) holder, Rahul Paswan and the agreement was written at his residence at Faridabad, for a sum of one crore



twenty lakh rupees, which was paid by cheque. The property was registered in his name on 03-01-2024. The possession of the plot was handed over to him and thereafter, he had constructed a boundary wall and a room on the site. Later on, he came to know that Randeep Raj Boora was trying to sell the said plot and upon investigation, he found that Randeep Raj Boora had prepared a GPA cancellation document on 08-09-2023. On enquiry, Rahul Paswan denied about the same. Rahul Paswan conducted his own inquiry and found that Randeep went to the Tehsil office alone and created a fraudulent document. Furthermore, on 23-10-2023, he had got the same land registered in the name of Mohammad Salman, despite the fact that Rahul had already executed an agreement in favor of the complainant on 10-04-2023. Rahul Paswan stated that Randeep Raj Boora has committed fraud against him and that he will take legal action. A few days ago, his servant informed him that some people had come to the plot, were making inquiries, and were telling him to vacate the plot. He had filed a civil case in this regard bearing No. 1715/2024, in the court and stay was granted. In sale deed qua Mohammad Salman, the property ID was shown to be in Sector-52, whereas the land is in Sector-57. Further, there were found to be certain discrepancies in both the registries. Moreover, in the seller's column, a photograph of someone else is stated to be affixed instead of Randeep Singh Boora.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contended that he has not been named in the FIR and no role has been attributed to him in the present FIR. He further contended that the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he is an attesting witness to the alleged GPA in question.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submitted that Anil while



posing as Randeep Raj Boora being owner in possession of the suit property had executed a GPA in favour of one Rahul Paswan on 6.4.2023. Allegedly, the said GPA was cancelled by co-accused Anil while posing as Randeep Raj Boora vide revocation of power of attorney dated 8.9.2023. He further contended that no notice of cancellation of GPA was given to Rahul Paswan who was allegedly competent to alienate the property based upon the said GPA. Rahul Paswan, the GPA holder further sold the property in favour of Aman Goyal and Puneet Gupta on the basis of GPA dated 6.4.2023. It is further contended that the petitioner Budh Ram alongwith his other co accused Amit Rehru, Anil who posed as Randip Raj Boora got a GPA no.3 dated 6.4.2023 executed in which he appeared as an attesting witness. The petitioner-Budh Ram took a sum of Rs. 50,000/- from Anil who posed as Randip Raj Boora and for the purpose of cancellation of GPA no. 75 of 8.9.2023, took a sum of Rs. 50,000/- in his bank account and further sum of Rs.50,000/- as commission and further submitted that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for both the parties and has considered the allegations made against the petitioner. Since the petitioner is an identifier of the impersonator namely Anil who impersonated himself as Randip Raj Boora and the petitioner had got money in lieu of that. The petitioner in his disclosure statement has admitted his involvement in the commission of the said crime. He was in knowledge of the fact that the impersonator is not the genuine person and the evidence has been collected by the prosecution regarding receiving of money by the petitioner. There are certain incriminating evidence against the petitioner as pointed out by the prosecution agency and also, the investigation is still going on, therefore the allegations made against petitioner are grave in nature and therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession



of regular bail.

6. In view of above, this Court finds no ground to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

November 06, 2025
Sonia Puri

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No