



CRM-M-69741-2025

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

107

**CRM-M-69741-2025
Decided on: 10.12.2025**

Satnam Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.0163 dated 17.11.2025, under Sections 318(4), 329(3), 62 of BNS at Police Station S.G.N. Dev Thermal Plant, Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the co-accused Bhupinder Singh is alleged to have got prepared a false sale deed in his own favour, and thereupon the property in question is shown to be purchased by the present petitioner for a total sale consideration of Rs. 24,75,000/-. There is nothing with the petitioner to show that the sale consideration was paid in actual through any bank transaction. The Court can not believe that the petitioner has not played any active role in playing fraud for getting the sale deed subsequent thereto in his own name.



CRM-M-69741-2025

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has produced a photocopy of Cheque No. 046940 dated 17.09.2024, having been issued in favour of one Bhupinder Singh for a sum of Rs. 6 lacs. He further submits that in fact initially the aforementioned cheque for a sum of Rs. 6 lacs was issued by the petitioner in favour of the earlier owner Bhupinder Singh, however, the said amount has been paid to him in cash (Rs. 24,75,000/-), cheque was never got encashed. The explanation given by the petitioner is also not believable because this kind of practise has been experienced by this Court many a times, in the cases of cheating and fraud, which it got confronted through such like petitions. Just to create an impression that the purchaser is a bonafide purchaser, some cheques are signed and then never shown to be encashed. Such a practise is not acceptable, rather believing in such a contention would promote using of this exercise, on routine basis, for developing their submissions before the respective Courts.

4. The petition is dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

10.12.2025

reena

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:	YES/ NO
Whether Reportable:	YES /NO