



S. No.205

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

**CRM-M-47632 of 2025
Date of Decision:07.11.2025**

Thakur Dass Adlakha

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Parshant Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal Anand, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. This is first petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.508 dated 03.09.2024 registered under Sections 120B, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Saran, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. The allegations against the petitioner are that petitioner had sold one shop to the complainant for a sale consideration of Rs.53 lakhs but he had already obtained the loan against the same and he had concealed this fact from the purchaser/ complainant. On 12.10.2023, notice was received from Bank of India, Nuh Branch, District Nuh Mewat, in which it was disclosed that the petitioner – Thakur Dass Adlakha had obtained a loan of Rs.8 lakhs against the said shop in the year 2014 out of which a sum of Rs.5,50,000/- was still outstanding. When he was confronted by the complainant, he allegedly threatened to kill her and her



family members. The documents were collected. Petitioner was arrested on 10.05.2025 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented in the Court for trial.

3. Upon notice, learned State Counsel has appeared. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that after registration of the FIR, his wife had deposited Rs.2 lakhs with the Bank to repay the balance amount of loan and after he was released on interim bail by this Court vide order dated 23.09.2025, he has repaid the entire loan amount against receipts dated 04.10.2025, 14.10.2025 and 22.10.2025 and now no amount is due. Learned counsel further contended that the petitioner remained in custody in this case from 10.05.2025 till he was released on interim bail vide order dated 23.09.2025. The trial will take some more time to conclude. All the offences are magisterial trial. No useful purpose will thus be served by keeping him in custody anymore and he may be released on bail.

5. Learned State Counsel opposed the bail petition and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous crime and in view of gravity of offence, he does not deserve benefit of bail.

6. Petitioner had sold the shop to the complainant for Rs.53 lakhs but he had already obtained a loan of Rs.8 lakhs from Bank of India by hypothecating the said shop and Bank served notice upon the purchaser, according to which a sum of Rs.5,50,000/- was still outstanding and petitioner has repaid the entire loan amount. Now investigation has already been completed and challan has been presented and in these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not



required and he deserves to be released on bail. Resultantly, present bail petition is accepted and the interim bail already granted vide order dated 23.09.2025 is made absolute till the conclusion of the trial subject to petitioner’s furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

November 07, 2025
renu

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