



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.209

CRM-M-8265-2026

Date of Decision: 07.04.2026

SACHIN ALIAS SHANKY

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Anil Kumar Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Digvijay, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR
No. 332 dated 08.12.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3),
340(2), 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita at Police Station Model Town,
Panipat, District Panipat.
2. The present FIR has been registered on the complaint of Smt.
Ritu Rani, resident of Gali No. 3, New Sainipura, Jattal Road, Panipat,
alleging that accused Karan Punia, his wife Radha, Sachin @ Shanky
(petitioner), his wife Kavita and Bhupinder hatched a criminal conspiracy to
cheat her. It is alleged that in furtherance of their common intention, they
induced the complainant to purchase a house measuring 150 sq. yards



situated in Sainipura Colony, Panipat by representing themselves to be the owners of the said property, which they claimed to have purchased earlier and offered to sell the same for a consideration of Rs. 35 lakhs. It is further alleged that the complainant and her mother transferred an amount of Rs. 7 lakhs on 04.03.2025 into the bank account of the petitioner Sachin @ Shanky, which was subsequently withdrawn. Thereafter, on the demand of the accused persons, the complainant paid another sum of Rs. 7 lakhs in cash on 09.04.2025, thus totaling Rs. 14 lakhs. Subsequently, an agreement to sell dated 09.04.2025 was executed in favour of the complainant. However, it later came to light that accused Karan Punia was not the owner of the house in question and the complainant had been cheated. On the basis of these allegations, the present FIR was registered. As per the police record, the allegations were reiterated in the statement of the complainant's mother, who confirmed the transfer of Rs. 7 lakhs through RTGS and payment of Rs. 7 lakhs in cash.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the alleged transaction and has neither induced the complainant nor received any wrongful gain. It is further argued that the property in question was owned by co-accused Karan Punia, who had purchased the same from Pawan through a valid agreement, and the petitioner has no ownership or share in the said property. It is contended that the petitioner merely knew both the complainant and the co-accused and had acted only as a witness to the



agreement. It is also submitted that the amount transferred in the account of the petitioner pertains to an earlier transaction between the parties and was not connected with the alleged agreement to sell. The dispute, if any, is purely of civil nature arising out of a property transaction, which has been given a criminal colour. It is further contended that there is an unexplained delay of about nine months in lodging the FIR, which casts doubt on the prosecution story. It is also argued that no offence of forgery is made out against the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the present petition and submitted that the petitioner is actively involved in the commission of the offence. It is contended that the investigation is still at a nascent stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to ascertain the truth and to recover the cheated amount. It is further submitted that the complainant had transferred an amount of Rs. 7,00,000/- in the bank account of the petitioner on 04.03.2025 from the account of her mother Kanta Devi, which is duly reflected in the bank record. Thereafter, part of the said amount was transferred by the petitioner into the account of co-accused Karan Punia, clearly indicating his active participation in the transaction. It is also contended that the petitioner, in connivance with co-accused persons, hatched a conspiracy to cheat the complainant on the false pretext of sale of property, despite the fact that the co-accused was not the lawful owner of the said property. It is further submitted that the plea of civil dispute is misconceived as the allegations disclose a clear case of cheating and



criminal conspiracy. The delay in registration of FIR has also been explained and there is no malafide on the part of the police. It is thus prayed that the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant and have gone through the record of the case. From the material available on record, it is evident that a specific amount of Rs. 7,00,000/- was transferred into the bank account of the petitioner Sachin @ Shanky, which is duly supported by bank statements. The record further reveals that the petitioner thereafter transferred part of the said amount to the account of co-accused Karan Punia, thereby establishing a clear nexus between the petitioner and the alleged transaction. The role attributed to the petitioner is not that of a mere witness, rather he appears to be an active participant in the conspiracy, who facilitated the transfer of money and was instrumental in inducing the complainant to part with a substantial amount on the false assurance of sale of property. The contention that the dispute is purely civil in nature cannot be accepted at this stage in view of the allegations of deceit and dishonest inducement from the very inception.

6. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the specific role of the petitioner, the monetary transaction reflected in his bank account, and the requirement of custodial interrogation to unearth the complete chain of events and involvement of other accused persons, this Court is of the opinion that no ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.



- 8. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.
- 9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

07.04.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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