



228

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

CRM-M No.59608 of 2025

Date of Decision: 07.11.2025

Tara Chand

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Abhishek Walia, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.186, dated 04.06.2025, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala, Haryana.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Saloni Goyal. It was alleged that she is living with her mother-in-law, namely, Suneeta Rani. Rajesh Kumar, son of Tara Chand, i.e. the petitioner and his mother, namely, Pali Devi had received Rs.1.5 Crore from them by executing an agreement to sell for the land measuring 34 kanal 15 marla. It was alleged that at the time of execution of the agreement, it was agreed that the sale deed would be executed within 2-3 months. Though at the time of signing



the agreement, the property was found to be free from all encumbrances except the loan, however later on it was found that the sellers had already executed another agreement to sell in favour of one Balram and he had already lodged an FIR against them. On asking, Pali Devi and Rajesh Kumar, they refused to execute the sale deed. It was found that they have entered into multiple agreements regarding the same property with other persons as well. It was alleged that the accused have cheated them by concealing the facts and thus, legal action be taken against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was also arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 27.07.2025. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 04.10.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner is a senior citizen, who has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that though the petitioner is the father of Rajesh Kumar, however it is apparent that the agreement to sell was entered into between Pali Devi and Suneeta Rani. He has submitted that the petitioner was not any party to the agreement to sell, despite that he has been roped in the present FIR. He has submitted that Pali Devi and son of the petitioner, namely, Rajesh Kumar have already been granted



bail by the learned trial Court and the petitioner is languishing behind bars without any fault on his part. He has submitted that the investigation is already complete and thus in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is the main accused. He has submitted that the petitioner is the head of the family and there is a money transaction also with the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is involved in one more case of the similar nature, however he is on bail in that case. and thus, he does not deserve the concession of bail and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has also opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is husband of Pali Devi, who has entered into agreement to sell with Suneeta Devi. However he does not dispute the fact that Pali Devi and Rajesh Kumar have already been granted bail by the learned trial Court. He, on instructions from SI Jarnail Singh, has submitted that the investigation is complete and challan is presented, however charges are yet to be framed. He has submitted that the petitioner is involved in one more case. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

6. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the dispute in the present case is regarding the



agreement to sell entered into between Pali Devi, i.e. wife of petitioner and Suneeta Rani. The petitioner, admittedly, was not the party to the agreement to sell. Pali Devi and Rajesh Kumar have already been granted bail by the learned trial Court. Investigation in the case is already complete. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 03 months and 10 days as on 06.11.2025. Though the petitioner is facing prosecution in one more case, however, as submitted before this Court, he is on bail in that case.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.11.2025

*rittu*

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

:  
:

Yes/No  
Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE