



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

**CRM-M-46583-2025
Date of decision: 17.11.2025**

MANMINDERJIT SINGH @ MANGA

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Karanjit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mayank Sharma, Advocate
for the complainant.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.33 dated 04.03.2025 registered at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

3. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Inderraj Singh with the allegations that he knew Jimmy Singh Chugh and Manminderjit Singh @ Manga (petitioner), who were property dealers. In the year 2023, both of them offered to sell two



and a half acres of land to him, which was owned by Rita Takkar. Later on, the deal was finalized and they took earnest money from him and handed over an earnest money agreement allegedly executed by Rita Takkar. However, later on, he came to know through Rita Takkar that the said agreement had not been executed by her and did not bear her signatures. It is also alleged that both of them have cheated many people in a similar manner and have taken huge amounts of money from them and he sought action against them. Matter was investigated. Co-accused Jimmy Singh Chugh was arrested and he suffered disclosure statement to the effect that they had executed the fake agreement to sell in connivance with the driver of Rita Takkar, who had provided them with her Aadhar card. Apprehending arrest, petitioner applied for anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide order dated 19.04.2025 (Annexure P-2).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The dispute is purely of civil nature which has been given the colour of criminality. Learned counsel for the petitioner next contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in his favour.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail and argued that in view of gravity of the offence, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.



6. It is well settled that the power to grant anticipatory bail is of extra-ordinary nature and is to be sparingly used with circumspection as held in 2022 (4) RCR (Criminal) 968 titled as "***Sachin @ Sachin Ahuja Vs. State of Punjab***". In SLP (Crl.) 7940 2023 titled as "***Shri Kant Upadhyay Vs. State of Bihar***", Hon'ble Apex Court has held that grant of interim protection or protection from arrest to an accused in a serious case may lead to miscarriage of justice and may hamper investigation to a great extent as it may sometimes lead to tampering or destruction of evidence. The court is cognizant of the fact that power of anticipatory bail is to be exercised in exceptional circumstances as it may cause some hindrance to normal flow of investigation which would undermine the case of the prosecution.

7. In the present case, one Rita Takkar owned two and a half acres of land and petitioner alongwith co-accused Jimmy Singh Chugh offered to sell the same to the complainant at the rate of Rs.4 crore per acre. Upon payment of an earnest money amount of Rs. 2 crore, they handed over the earnest money agreement to the complainant. However, Rita Takkar, the owner of the land, later stated that it was a fake document and did not bear her signature and has not been executed by her. In this manner, the petitioner along with the co-accused induced the complainant to deliver them a huge sum of Rs. 2 crore by cheating him. The offence in question committed by the petitioner is serious in nature and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is thus essential to elicit the *modus operandi* adopted by the accused in committing the crime. Moreover, petitioner is not likely to answer the questions in the right earnest



in case, he is interrogated under the protective umbrella of the order of ad-interim protection that may be passed by this Court and grant of anticipatory bail will thus hamper the investigation.

8. Resultantly, this Court is of the considered opinion that in view of the gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and accordingly, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

9. Pending misc. application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

17.11.2025
Priyanka Thakur

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

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