



CRM-M-50593-2025

- 1-

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

224

**CRM-M-50593-2025
Date of decision: 10.12.2025**

MOHAMMAD IQBAL

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Kunal Dawar, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Shashikant Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. Present petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.179 dated 14.04.2025, under Sections 420 and 120-B of IPC (Sections 467, 468 and 471 of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sector 58, Faridabad, Haryana.
2. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by Sangeeta Devi with the allegations that accused Mohammad Iqbal and Mohammad Mubarak had entered into an agreement to sell one plot measuring 44 sq. yards in her favour for a total sum of Rs.3,33,000/-. They had given Rs.81,100/- to accused Mohammad Iqbal as earnest money and balance amount was to be paid on 11.01.2017 and on the same day, sale deed was to be executed. She alongwith her husband was working in some company and they did not have sufficient source of income and thereafter, it was decided that balance amount will be paid to accused Mohammad Iqbal in installments. Thereafter, accused No.2

**CRM-M-50593-2025**

- 2-

used to visit their house and collect money from them and money was paid upto 16.07.2020 and it was agreed that sale deed will be executed once the entire payment is made. Thereafter, they paid the entire amount but accused kept on postponing the execution and registration of the sale deed and now they have refused to execute the sale deed. Rather, they threatened to kill them in case they demand their money back and have also refused to handover the possession of the plot to them and she sought action against them.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the dispute on the face of it is purely civil in nature and in case any agreement was executed and sale deed had not been got registered, complainant had the remedy to sue the petitioner for specific performance of the agreement. Petitioner is in custody since 09.07.2025. Learned counsel next contended that challan has already been presented after completion of investigation. All the offences are Magisterial trial. The trial is likely to take a long time to conclude and further detention of the petitioner is not required and he may be released on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the bail and argued that in view of the gravity of the offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. Petitioner is in custody since 09.07.2025. The challan has already been presented after completion of investigation. All the offences are Magisterial trial. The dispute pertains to non-execution of the sale deed in pursuance to the agreement executed between the parties and *prima facie*, dispute appears to be civil in nature. Trial is likely to take a long time to conclude and further detention

**CRM-M-50593-2025****- 3-**

of the petitioner is thus not required and he deserves to be released on bail.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

10.12.2025
amandeep

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