



210

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14904-2026
Decided on : 08.04.2026

Subhash

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jaspreet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Ashok K. Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

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 First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Subhash, aged about 45 years	138	22.04.2024	420 & 406 of IPC [318(4) & 316(2) of BNS, 2023]	Civil Line Jind	Jind

2. In the present case, on 18.03.2026, following order was passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court:-

“2. Briefly, the facts of the case are that the present FIR has been registered on the allegations that the complainant had purchased a house from co-accused Somvati for a total sale consideration of Rs.20 lacs, out of which, he paid Rs.14,70,000/- through cheque and remaining amount in cash. However, it later transpired that a loan was already subsisting on the said property, which fact was allegedly concealed from the complainant. The present petitioner is stated to be only an attesting witness to the disputed sale deed. The transaction is disputed on the ground that the loan standing on the property owned by co-accused Somvati was not disclosed to the vendee. It is the specific case of the petitioner that he had no role to play in the said concealment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and he is merely an attesting witness to the sale deed in question. It is further submitted that the alleged



concealment of loan, if any, is attributable solely to co-accused Somvati, who was the owner/vendor of the property, and the petitioner had no concern with the same.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sushil Bhardwaj, Addl. A.G. Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and contests the petition on the ground that serious allegations of cheating have been levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is none else but the husband of the main accused Somvati. However, it is not disputed that co-accused Somvati has already been released on bail.*

6. *I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case file.*

7. *Keeping in view the fact that the main accused Somvati, who is alleged to have concealed the fact of loan standing on the property sold by her, has already been released on bail and the only role attributed to the petitioner is that he is an attesting witness to the said sale deed, this Court deems it appropriate to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner.*

8. *Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on interim bail subject to his joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer concerned within one week from today, on furnishing of personal/security bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.*

9. *List on 08.04.2026."*

2. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 18.03.2026, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 18.03.2026, passed by this Court is hereby made **absolute**.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as



and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

6. Accordingly, petition stands **disposed of**, accordingly.

7. However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 08, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No