

2025:PHHC:160610



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.50682 of 2025
Date of Decision: 19.11.2025
Reserved on: 03.11.2025

Krishan Lal Bishnoi ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sartej Singh Narula, Senior Advocate with
Dr. Amardeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Tanvir Singh Attariwala, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under
Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short
“BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
249	05.09.2023	Sector-14, Gurugram District Gurugram	420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC (419 of IPC added later on)

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of
this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis

2025:PHHC:160610



of a complaint lodged by the complainant Dharamvir alleging that his father was owner of a plot situated in Sector 23-23A, Gurugram. He had died on 15.07.2010. All formalities qua ownership of that plot were completed in favour of his father. He alleged that the present petitioner and his son Vikas Bishnoi, who are his relatives were well aware about the factum of death of his father. They hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused to usurp that plot and in pursuance of that conspiracy, they engaged accused Kirta Ram who impersonated himself as father of the complainant by forging documents of identity etc. and by representing him as such, the petitioner and co-accused got registered a conveyance deed qua the plot owned by his father, in the name of accused Rampal Singh Tomar and Nisha Singh. The attesting witnesses to the sale deed were also conniving with the petitioner and identified the impersonator Kirta Ram as father of the complainant thereby cheating the complainant.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The accused Vikas Bishnoi was arrested on 04.04.2024. He suffered disclosure statement admitting the factum of hatching conspiracy with the co-accused and his involvement in the crime of causing wrongful loss to the complainant and cheating him by way of transfer of the property owned by his father in the name of Rampal Singh Tomar and Nisha Tomar by receiving huge amount of money and by way of impersonation by co-accused Kirta Ram. The present petitioner was arrested on 19.03.2025. He too suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and

also admitting the fact that he had stood witness to the conveyance deed and

2025:PHHC:160610



had identified impersonator Kirta Ram as Sunil Kumar. He also admitted his active participation in getting sale deed of the property in question registered in favour of accused Rampal Singh Tomar and Nisha Singh. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case by the complainant out of personal vendetta and due to a failed business venture concerning a land development project between the son of the petitioner and himself. He had got registered two more FIRs against the petitioner only to exert pressure upon them. There is no material on record to prove his complicity in the crime. He never affixed his signature on conveyance deed or any other document. He is not beneficiary of any transaction. No money has been received by him. The dispute between the parties is of civil nature which has been given a criminal colour. Co-accused Sudesh Kumar has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. While refuting the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner, it is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana assisted by learned counsel for the complainant that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who had hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused to deprive the complainant of the property belonging to his

2025:PHHC:160610



father and inherited by him, with an intent to cause wrongful loss of money to him and to cheat him. The petitioner along with the co-accused Sudesh Kumar stood witness to the conveyance deed and identified the impersonator Kirta Ram as Sunil Kumar who had already died. He is a habitual offender as several other cases of similar nature are pending against him. There are chances of his committing similar offences or absconding if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused Vikas Bishnoi is alleged to have hatched a conspiracy to deprive the complainant of the property owned by his father and inherited by him and in pursuance of that conspiracy, conveyance deed qua the concerned property was got registered by them in favour of some other persons by impersonating the deceased father of the complainant and on the basis of false and fake documents. The petitioner and co-accused Vikas Bishnoi are near relatives of the complainant and are presumed to be well aware of the factum of death of the deceased Sunil Kumar. The petitioner also stood an attesting witness to the conveyance deed. His son and himself were the mastermind of the crime in causing wrongful loss to the complainant and for their wrongful gain. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He is a man of criminal antecedents as five more cases of similar nature have been registered against him. The apprehension expressed by the respondent that

2025:PHHC:160610



he may flee or commit similar offences, therefore, cannot be considered to be without any basis at this stage. The case of the petitioner cannot be stated to be on parity with that of co-accused Sudesh Kumar as the allegations against him are more serious. There is nothing on record to infer that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial.

8. The bail petition of similarly situated Vikas Bishnoi already stands cancelled by this Court. The complainant has also placed on record Annexure C-9 copy of order passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court showing that the SLP filed by the co-accused Vikas Bishnoi has also been dismissed as withdrawn. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case lest the same prejudice the trial, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

19.11.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No