



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.214

CRM-M-13704-2026
Date of Decision: 07.04.2026

KARAN PUNIA

...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 482 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (or under Section 438 Cr.P.C.) 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
(corresponding Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC) 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 (petitioner), along with co-accused Radha,
Sachin @ Shanky, Kavita and Bhupinder, hatched a criminal conspiracy to



cheat her on the pretext of sale of a house measuring 150 sq. yards situated in Sainipura Colony, Panipat. It is alleged that the accused represented themselves to be the owners of the said property and induced the complainant to purchase the same for a total sale consideration of Rs. 35 lakhs. It is further alleged that the complainant and her mother transferred an amount of Rs. 7,00,000/- in the account of co-accused Sachin @ Shanky on 04.03.2025 and thereafter paid another sum of Rs. 7,00,000/- in cash to the accused persons, thus making a total payment of Rs. 14 lakhs. An agreement to sell dated 09.04.2025 was also executed in favour of the complainant. However, it later came to light that the petitioner was not the owner of the said property and had cheated the complainant. On these allegations, the present FIR was registered.

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 offence and has been roped in with ulterior motives. It is further argued that the dispute between the parties is purely of civil nature arising out of a property transaction, which has been given a criminal colour only to pressurize the petitioner. It is contended that the complainant herself had offered to purchase the plot adjoining her residence and had voluntarily paid the amount. It is also submitted that the petitioner was merely a witness to the agreement dated 09.04.2025 and had no ownership or proprietary interest in the property in question. The amount allegedly transferred in the account of co-accused Sachin @ Shanky is stated to be part of a separate transaction



and not connected with the alleged agreement. It is further contended that there is an unexplained delay of about nine months in lodging the FIR, which creates doubt regarding the veracity of the allegations. It is also argued that no offence of forgery or other serious offences is made out against the petitioner and that the offences are otherwise bailable in nature.

5. 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 and is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail. It is contended that the allegations disclose a well-planned conspiracy wherein the petitioner, along with co-accused, induced the complainant to part with a substantial amount on the false pretext of sale of property. It is further submitted that an amount of Rs. 7,00,000/- was initially transferred by the complainant in the account of co-accused Sachin @ Shanky and thereafter a sum of Rs. 2,80,000/- out of the said amount was transferred into the account of the present petitioner, which clearly establishes his direct involvement in the transaction. It is also argued that the petitioner falsely projected himself to be the owner of the property in question, whereas in fact he had no valid title over the same, thereby cheating the complainant. It is further submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to unearth the entire conspiracy and to recover the cheated amount. The plea of civil dispute is stated to be misconceived in view of the dishonest intention from the very inception.

6. 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 *prima facie* emerges that the petitioner has played a central role in the alleged occurrence. The record reveals that the complainant was induced to part with a total amount of Rs. 14,00,000/- on the representation that the petitioner was the owner of the property and was competent to sell the same. However, it has come on record that the petitioner was not the lawful owner of the said property. Further, out of the amount transferred by the complainant, a sum of Rs. 2,80,000/- was credited into the account of the present petitioner through co-accused Sachin @ Shanky, thereby establishing a clear monetary trail and his active participation in the offence.

7. The contention of the petitioner that the dispute is civil in nature cannot be accepted at this stage, as the allegations clearly indicate dishonest inducement and cheating from the very inception. The execution of the agreement to sell and the receipt of earnest money further strengthen the prosecution case that the petitioner was instrumental in deceiving the complainant. The role attributed to the petitioner, coupled with the financial transactions and the fact that the property was misrepresented as belonging to him, reflects a *prima facie* case of cheating and criminal conspiracy.

8. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the amount involved, the active role of the petitioner, and the necessity 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.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.



10. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

11 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