

**CRM-M No.14279 of 2026;
CRM-M No.27612 of 2026**

-1-



207+217

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

CRM-M No.14279 of 2026

Rajwant Singh @ Banty

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CRM-M No.27612 of 2026

Sahab Singh @ Sabi @ Sahib Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

Date of Decision: 25.05.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-14279-2026.

Mr. Sukhdev Singh Gopera, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-27612-2026.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. By this order, I dispose of the above mentioned two petitions arising out of the same FIR.
2. Both the petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.137, dated

14.06.2025, under Sections 316(2), 318(2) & 318(4) of BNS (subsequently Sections 167, 319, 336(3) 338, 340 & 61 of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Guhla, District Kaithal.

3. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the complainant, namely, Joginder Singh made a complaint to Economic Cell, Kaithal, which was received in Police Station Guhla, wherein it is averred that action be taken against Karamjit, Joginder, Angrej and two other persons. The allegations against these persons are that the complainants, namely, Joginder Singh and Shishpal intended to purchase the land and the accused Karamjit, Joginder Singh and Angrej Singh were the property dealers, who showed complainants some land at village Shadipur, Tehsil Guhla and also informed the complainant party that the land belongs to Amarjit Singh and Kamaljit Singh, who were known to these property dealers. The deal was agreed for 50 Kanals 15 Marlas. Amarjit Singh and Kamaljit Singh entered into an agreement on 12.03.2025 with complainant party @ Rs.37,75,000/- per acre. Rs.60,00,000/- were given to Amarjit Singh and Kamaljit Singh as earnest money. Out of this money, Rs. 10,00,000/- were given by Joginder Singh from his HDFC Bank; Shishpal gave Rs.10,00,000/- from his bank i.e. Bank of Maharashtra, Kaithal and Rs.40,00,000/- were given in cash. Subsequently, on the insistence of Amarjit Singh and Kamaljit Singh, Rs.20,00,000/- was given. Out of which Rs.15,00,000/- were through Cheque and Rs.5,00,000/- were given in cash. As per this agreement, registry was to be executed on 22.05.2025 but when the

complainant parties appeared before Sub-Registrar office on 22.05.2025, accused persons did not reach and even their phones got switched off after sometime. In fact, after some time complainant came to know that accused Amarjit Singh and Kamaljit Singh were not the actual owners of the said property, rather the property dealers namely Karamjit Singh, Joginder Singh and Angrej Singh in criminal conspiracy have produced fake people instead of actual owners. Thus, the complainant party has been duped for an amount of Rs.80,00,000/-. It also came into light that Kamaljit Singh is actually Simranjeet Singh son of Surjeet Singh, resident of village Bedpuri and Amarjeet Singh is actually Rahul son of Shyam Lal, resident of Amamgarh Mohalla, Samana, Punjab. Their Aadhar Cards were taken into police possession, specimen signatures were obtained. Their bank account statements and mobile phones were taken into police possession. Hence, a request was made to take legal action against the culprits. Thus, FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of both the petitioners, namely, Rajwant Singh @ Banty (in CRM-M-14279-2026) and Sahab Singh @ Sabi @ Sahib Singh (in CRM-M-27612-2026) surfaced and thus, they were arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioners were arrested on 06.08.2025 and 23.06.2025, respectively. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both

the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal declined the bail application filed by both the petitioners vide order dated 06.02.2026 and 18.02.2026, respectively. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petitions.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners have contended before this Court that the petitioners have been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. They have submitted that neither the petitioners were named in the FIR nor any allegations have been made against them, however, they have been implicated in the present case during the investigation on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, which in itself is not even an admissible evidence. They have submitted that the allegations regarding the impersonation are qua the co-accused and not against the petitioners. They have submitted that the petitioner, namely, Rajwant Singh @ Banty, has taken the commission in the transaction of the amount received by the co-accused, whereas the petitioner, namely, Sahab Singh @ Sabi @ Sahib Singh has taken the commission of Rs.15,00,000/-. To buttress their arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that the main accused in the present case, who was the master mind, is the co-accused, namely, Karamjit Singh and he has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by Hon'ble the Supreme Court vide order dated 09.04.2026 passed in SLP(Crl.) No.12528 of 2025. They have placed on record a copy of order dated 09.04.2026 passed by Hon'ble the Supreme

Court. They have submitted that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest and have suffered an incarceration of more than 09/10 months. They have submitted that the investigation is complete and charges have also been framed, however, there is no material progress in the trial. They have submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the petitioners along with the co-accused has hatched a conspiracy to dupe the complainant party. He has submitted that the complainant party has been duped for an amount of Rs.80,00,000/-. He has submitted that both the petitioners have facilitated the transaction of the cash amount in the bank account of co-accused. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced custody certificates of both the petitioners today in the Court, which are taken on record.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that both the petitioners were not named in the FIR, however, they were arrayed as an accused in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. The allegations regarding impersonation of the original owners are against the co-accused, namely, Kamaljit Singh and Amarjeet Singh. As submitted before this Court by

learned counsel for the petitioners that the co-accused, namely, Karamjit Singh, has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by Hon'ble the Supreme Court vide order dated 09.04.2026. Out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far. The petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest, i.e. 06.08.2025 and 23.06.2025. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioner, namely, Rajwant Singh @ Banty has suffered an incarceration of 09 months and 18 days, whereas the petitioner, namely, Sahab Singh @ Sabi @ Sahib Singh has suffered an incarceration of 10 months and 28 days as on 23.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner, namely, Rajwant Singh @ Banty is involved in 02 other cases, however, in one case he has been discharged and in 01 case he has been acquitted, whereas the petitioner, namely, Sahab Singh @ Sabi @ Sahib Singh is involved in 05 other cases, however, in 04 of the cases, he is on bail.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The arguments and counter arguments as raised before this Court would be assessed by the learned trial Court on the appreciation of the evidences led by both the sides, however, keeping in view the custody of the petitioners and their antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the

sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsels for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

10. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

11. However, if the petitioner, namely, Sahab Singh @ Sabi @ Sahib Singh does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

12. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

25.05.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No