



104
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.45323 of 2025
Date of decision: 20.08.2025

Satnam Singh Sandhu ... Petitioner

Vs.
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Impinder Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
10	30.01.2025	City Zira, District Ferozepur	319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”)

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant Bogha Singh alleging therein that

2025:PHHC:109632



he was interested to buy some chunk of land and had approached the co-accused Satpal Singh, who is a property dealer by profession in the month of August 2024, for this purpose. The accused Satpal Singh had subsequently called him for effecting deal qua purchase of some property. On 30.09.2024, the complainant along with his son Jaswinder Singh had gone to the office of the accused Satpal Singh wherein the present petitioner and the co-accused Sukhdev Singh were also present. They introduced the complainant with a female sitting therein as Rupinder Kaur wife of Inderjit Singh, resident of Village Balkhandi and also told to him that the said Rupinder Kaur owned 68 Kanals 1 Marla of land in the area of Village Atari and interested to sell the same. The accused Satpal Singh got effected a deal for purchase of land of the said Rupinder Kaur in favour of complainant. The sale consideration amount was agreed to be paid @ Rs.30,25,000/- per acre. On asking of the petitioner and the co-accused Sukhdev Singh and Satpal Singh, the complainant gave a sum of Rs.20 lakhs in cash on 04.10.2024 to the aforementioned Rupinder Kaur and cheque for an amount of Rs.9,50,000/- was given to her by way of earnest money. A written agreement to sell was executed on the same day which was signed by the petitioner, co-accused Sukhdev Singh and Satpal Singh as well as by the above named Rupinder Kaur. However, before registration of the sale deed, the complainant came to know that a fraud was being played upon

2025:PHHC:109632



him and the petitioner as well as the co-accused by impersonating some other female as Rupinder Kaur, had duped him of aforementioned amount of money as infact the original Rupinder Kaur was not interested to sell her property. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre arrest bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur vide order dated 18.07.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The dispute between the parties is of civil nature. There is delay of about four months in reporting the matter to the police which has not been explained. No money was handed over to him. He is not beneficiary to the transaction. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. He is ready to join the investigation. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab has advance notice of the petition. Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complainant and has filed Memorandum of Appearance. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that there are serious and specific

2025:PHHC:109632



allegations against the petitioner who by hatching a conspiracy with the co-accused induced the complainant to enter into an agreement to purchase some land owned by one Rupinder Kaur, but by impersonating the said Rupinder Kaur and by producing some other female, the petitioner and the co-accused extracted cash amount of Rs.20 lakhs and cheque for a sum of Rs.9,50,000/- from the complainant. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for conducting thorough investigation in the matter, for tracing out the whereabouts of the female who impersonated herself as Rupinder Kaur and also for eliciting information as to the manner in which the conspiracy was hatched by the petitioner. No extraordinary and exceptional circumstance for grant of pre arrest bail is made out. The petitioner is a man of criminal antecedents as two more cases have been registered against him. Accordingly, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have connived with the co-accused and in pursuance of a conspiracy hatched with them is alleged to have induced the complainant to part with a sum of Rs.20 lakhs in cash and also took cheque of an amount of Rs.9,50,000/-. Though the said cheque had been returned but wrongful loss to the tune of Rs.20 lakhs had been caused to the complainant. The allegations against the petitioner are

2025:PHHC:109632



specific and serious in nature. The case is at its nascent stage. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is well settled that the custodial interrogation of a suspected person is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favourable order of anticipatory bail. Moreso, in the present case, no exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.08.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No