



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

109

CRM-M-15645-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 20.03.2026

Satpal Singh Johal @ Satpal Singh ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Mandeep Singh Sachdev, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Meher Sachdev, Advocate and
Mr. Om Malhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 (438 of Cr.P.C.), has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.269 dated 14.11.2024, registered under Section 420, 406 and 34 of IPC, at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the FIR was lodged on 14.11.2024, i.e. after an inordinate and unexplained delay of eight years from the date of execution of sale deed i.e. 23.09.2016. It is further submitted that the dispute is of civil nature and has been deliberately twisted to give it criminal colour. It is further submitted that the complainant was not a party to the sale deed. Case of the petitioner is based on documentary evidence, and no recovery is to be made from the petitioner. Accordingly, learned counsel prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the



petitioner, submitting that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner colluded with the other co-accused to defraud the complainant's sister, an NRI, by selling her the property in question, which had already been sold to another person; the petitioner misled the sister of the complainant into purchasing the property, despite being fully aware of its prior sale. Learned State counsel also points to a compromise dated 12.08.2024 allegedly entered into by the petitioner, wherein he assured the repayment of Rs.24,00,000/- (sale consideration) to the complainant. However, as the petitioner failed to honour this assurance, hence, the present FIR was registered. The learned State Counsel contended that the delay in filing the FIR is explained as arising from the failed assurances given by the petitioner and subsequent non-adherence to the compromise.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and the allegations against the petitioner that he defrauded complainant's sister, an NRI, by selling property to her which was already sold to third person; petitioner was actively involved in misleading the complainant's sister despite being fully aware of its prior sale; sale consideration of Rs.24 Lakhs was paid by the complainant's sister, which has not been returned even though via compromise dated 12.08.2024, the same



CRM-M-15645-2026 (O&M) (3)

was undertaken to be returned, hence, this Court is not inclined to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation in case titled as ‘**CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806’ decided on 03.08.1997**, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands **dismissed**.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court on the merits of the case.

20.03.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No