



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-61264-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.09.2025

Tarun Kumar Garg

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Ganesh Chand Sharma, Advocate (through VC)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Varun Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. A.S. Barnala, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Sahota, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') in case FIR No.897 dated 11.11.2024 under Sections 418, 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Palla, Faridabad.

2. On the 05.12.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had issued notice of motion:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner had, no doubt, sold the plot in question to the complainant 10 months prior to the alleged occurrence in question i.e. when one Jogendra Rana came to the plot and demolished the construction which was being raised by the complainant. Learned counsel has

submitted that in fact Jogendra Rana was an encroacher and the allegations levelled in the FIR in question that a fraud had been played by the petitioner upon the complainant by selling a piece of land which was not registered in his name, was baseless and against the relevant records.”

3. Thereafter, on 19.03.2025, this Court had noticed following submissions made by the learned State counsel:-

“Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, on instructions, has stated to the contrary and has submitted that no doubt, the petitioner had joined investigation, however, on the pretext of relieving himself, he fled away from the Police Station. It has also been submitted that incorrect submissions were advanced by the counsel for the petitioner of there being a civil litigation pending between the parties qua the property in question. Learned State counsel submits that the civil litigation is not between the petitioner and the complainant but the earlier seller of the property in question (from whom the petitioner purportedly purchased the property). It has also been submitted by the learned State counsel that the petitioner had been indulging in selling the same parcel of land to different persons and in which regard, he would wish to file a specific reply.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 18.12.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the counsel opposite and reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR in question.

6. Learned State counsel, on instructions from PSI Abhishek, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further

investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

7. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 18.12.2024, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

8. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

17.09.2025
Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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