



S. No.211

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

**CRM-M-48550 of 2025
Date of Decision:06.11.2025**

Angrej Singh**.....Petitioner****Vs.****State of Punjab****.....Respondent****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present:- Mr. Abhaysher Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Achin Gupta and Mr. Karan Bansal, Advocates
for the complainant.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. This is first bail application moved under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.87 dated 30.06.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Sadiq, District Faridkot.

2. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the Police by Harinder Singh with the allegations that petitioner's father namely Kulwant Singh had good relationship with him and they used to have financial transaction between them. Accused party had purchased two acres of land in Village Deep Singh Wala and they had taken loan of Rs.5,50,000/- from the



complainant. In exchange of this amount, accused executed a written agreement dated 26.05.2021 in which accused agreed to take an additional amount of Rs.50,000/- and to execute the Registry of the said land for the complainant. Thereafter, accused executed the said document and handed over the possession to complainant. The contract amount of the said land for the years 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 was paid by the accused to the complainant party. Thereafter, accused party received an additional amount of Rs.1,20,000/- from the complainant and besides this, a written document regarding receipt of Rs.1,20,000/- in cash was executed by the accused. Due to mutual trust, complainant accepted version of Angrej Singh and on 17.05.2023, Angrej Singh received Rs.2 lakhs and on 24.05.2023, he received Rs.1 lakh through cheques from the complainant. Thereafter, he continued to take money from the complainant for his other requirements and complainant kept a record in his diary of the amount taken by Angrej Singh from time to time against his signatures. In all, Angrej Singh received a sum of Rs.12,78,700/- for him and later on, he refused to get the sale deed executed in respect of the said land in favour of complainant as complainant's father Kulwant Singh had passed away. Subsequently, when the complainant asked Angrej Singh to return his money, he issued a cheque for Rs.10 lakhs dated 10.08.2024 in conspiracy with his wife Charanjit Kaur from the bank account of Charanjit Kaur and the cheque was signed by accused himself alleging that it was a joint account of Angrej Singh with his wife but the cheque was dishonored and he sought action against the accused.



3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. Complainant has already instituted a complaint under Section 138 of the NI Act in respect of dishonor of cheque. The case against the petitioner is based on documentary evidence. Nothing is to be recovered from his possession. He 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 counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence. He had the intention to cheat the victim from the very beginning and in order to return the amount, he issued cheque for Rs.10 lakhs from the account of his wife by appending his own signatures claiming that it was a joint account with his wife. The cheque was dishonored and complainant thus has been duped of his hard earned money and in view of gravity of offence, the petitioner does not deserve concession of bail.

6. There are serious allegations against the petitioner. In order to discharge his liability towards complainant, he issued a cheque for Rs.10 lakhs from the account of his wife Charanjit Kaur claiming that it was a joint account with his wife. He himself signed the cheque and issued the same to the complainant which was dishonored on the ground that the cheque belongs to the account of Charanjit Kaur and not to the petitioner. As such, intention of the



accused was to cheat the complainant from the very beginning and petitioner is thus not entitled to discretionary relief of anticipatory bail in view of gravity of the offence and accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

November 06, 2025
renu

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