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

CRM-M No.7574 of 2026

Manish Kumar ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	23.04.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	29.04.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	29.04.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Simerpreet Sekhon, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Aman Jha, 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**
337	30.08.2024	DLF Sector 29, Gurugram, District Gurugram	419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC

2. As per the allegations, a complaint was submitted by complainant Radhika, an advocate by profession alleging that Hans Raj Narula who was a senior UNICEF official serving in various countries and capacities and who along with his family members, had shifted to USA in June 1982, had applied for allotment of a plot on 16.08.1985 in the name of his son Gaurav Narula. A plot bearing No.A-104 situated at Sushant Lok Gurugram was allotted in his favour by promoters/builders Ansal Properties and Industries (P) Ltd. Sale deed qua this plot was registered in favour of Gaurav Narula in the year 1991. It was alleged that in January 2024, Gaurav Narula and his mother came to know from some property dealer that a deal to sell abovesaid plot had been made by someone while claiming himself to be power of attorney holder of Gaurav Narula. The said property dealer also shared photograph of a document dated 07.09.2023 indicating that Gaurav Narual had acknowledged receipt of payment in US dollars to the tune of Rs.1,20,222/- in consideration for sale of plot. The names of the parties involved were mentioned in the said document. The passport number as well as the US address of Gaurav Narula were not correctly mentioned in that document. Gaurav Narula had obviously never given any power of attorney in favour of anyone. His mother came to India and on making inquiries came

to know that a fake transfer deed was created showing transfer of the property in question by Gaurav Narula in favour of the present petitioner. The petitioner had claimed that he was real brother of Gaurav Narula. The signatures of Gaurav Narula on the transfer deed were forged. Photograph of some impostor was affixed on the transfer deed projecting him as victim Gaurav Narula. Infact, Gaurav Narula had not visited India since January 2020. His address and particulars were also not correctly mentioned. By alleging that a fake and forged transfer deed had been prepared with intent to play fraud upon the victim Gaurav Narula, for the purpose of grabbing land property owned by him and with intent to cause wrongful loss to the victim, prayer had been made for taking action.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. It was also revealed that forged Aadhar Card and PAN card purported to be that of the victim, were used at the time of execution and registration of the transfer deed. It was also revealed that on 06.04.2025, the petitioner had sold the plot in question to one Anand Aggarwal on the basis of the abovesaid fake transfer deed for sale consideration of an amount of Rs.10,63,67,000/- out of which an amount of Rs.2,71,00,000/- was transferred in the bank account of the petitioner through RTGS and the remaining amount was given through PDC. The petitioner was arrested on 28.08.2025. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement and showing that he in connivance with the co-accused Varun Jain and Bakhshish had hatched a conspiracy and created fake Aadhar

Cards and PAN cards in the name of the victim Gaurav Narula and himself, had opened bank accounts using fake IDs and used the same to fraudulently transfer the plot of Gaurav Narula in his name and sold the same further. He disclosed that he was supposed to receive an amount of Rs.10 crores in the deal. An amount of Rs.7.30 crores was paid by the purchaser Anand Aggarwal and out of the same, he had received share of Rs.60-62 lakhs. The above named Varun Jain and Bakhshish were nominated as additional accused. Subsequently, some other accused were nominated. Investigation qua the petitioner now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is not required for further investigation. He is not beneficiary of the alleged transactions. The chain of persons who actually arranged the impersonation, forged identities, facilitated registration and dealt with the alleged proceeds, is yet to be traced. The money deposited in his account has been transferred to multiple accounts/entities. The bank entries by themselves do not determine his culpability at this stage. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. The disclosure statement allegedly suffered by him cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. The charges are yet to be framed and, therefore, there are no chances of conclusion of trial in near future. He is in custody for a period of more than eight months. No useful purpose would be served by his further incarceration. The main accused are yet to be arrested. It is also argued that infact, it was the absconding co-accused Varun Jain who is the

mastermind of the crime and who had taken the major part of the money transferred in the bank account of the petitioner. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon authorities cited as ***Sanjay Chandra v. CBI, 2011(4) RCR (Criminal) 898; Dipak Shubhashchandra Mehta v. C.B.I. and another, 2012(1) RCR (Criminal) 870; Ashok Dhingra v. N.C.T. of Delhi, 2001 SCC (Cri) 641; Vineet Jain v. Union of India, 2025 SCC Online SC 2331; Mohan Singh v. Union Territory, Chandigarh, 1978 (2) SCC 366; Suresh Kalmadi v. CBI, 2012 (5) RCR (Criminal) 556; Mahesh Kumar v. Central Bureau of Investigation, 2014(8) RCR (Criminal) 1650; Giri Raj v. State of Haryana, 2019(1) RCR (Criminal) 530; Bhupinder Singh v. State of Punjab and others, Law Finder Doc Id # 2200202; Surinder Pal Singh v. State of Punjab, Law Finder Doc Id # 1761887; Mahinder Sharma v. State Tax Officer, State Tax, Mobile Wing, Jalandhar, Punjab and others, 2023 (1) RCR (Criminal) 232; Pawan Kumar and other v. State of Punjab and others, 2025 NCPHHC 73945; Mohit Singla v. Directorate General of Goods and Services Tax Intelligence and another, 2026:PHHC:018368.*** It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail.

5. Per contra, learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner who is infact the prime accused and had orchestrated the entire crime in collusion with the other accused. He not only got prepared false and fabricated documents as to the identity of the victim Gaurav Narula but also forged his signatures,

photographs and passport etc. and on the basis of the same got registered a transfer deed by impersonating someone as Gaurav Narula and by showing himself to be real brother of the victim. Not even this, he sold the property of victim further to buyer Anand Aggarwal for a sum of Rs.10 crores. An amount of Rs.7.30 crores was transferred by Anand Aggarwal in the Yes Bank account of the petitioner which was also got opened on the basis of false and fabricated documents of identity and address etc. He had withdrawn the proceeds of crime in cash as well as by buying the property in the name of his wife. The investigation is still underway qua the co-accused who are yet to be arrested. The case is at its nascent stage. There are chances of petitioner's absconding, intimidating the witnesses, causing hindrance in apprehension of other accused or tampering with evidence, if extended benefit of bail. His antecedents are also not clean as he is involved in two other cases. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner by hatching a conspiracy with the co-accused is alleged to have got registered a deed of transfer of the property owned by the victim Gaurav Narula by impersonating someone as the victim and by claiming himself to be real brother of the victim. An amount of Rs.7,30,00,000/- was deposited in his bank account. The claim of the petitioner that it had been given to co-accused Varun Jain and he was the mastermind of the crime has no basis at this stage. The allegations against

the petitioner are quite serious. The offence under Section 467 of IPC attracts sentence of life imprisonment. The authorities which have been cited by learned counsel for the petitioner cannot be stated to be applicable to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case. More so, it is well settled proposition of law that the orders qua grant of bail have no precedential value. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the observations made in ***Gajanand Agarwal v. State of Orissa and others, (2006) 12 SCC 131***. Taking into consideration the serious nature of the accusations as levelled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail at this stage. As such, finding no compelling ground to allow the petition, the same is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

29.04.2026
manju

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