



CRM-M-24689-2026 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-24689-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision : 07.05.2026

SAGAR TANWAR

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Samay Singh Sandhawalia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)CRM-19292-2026

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-24689-2026

1. This is the second petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.98 dated 08.03.2024 registered at Police Station Sector-56, Gurugram under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 201 and 120-B IPC (corresponding Sections 319, 318, 337, 338, 340, 238 and 61 of BNS, 2023).

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner allegedly impersonated himself as 'Sagar Jain' and sold the property in question to Rakesh Babu by mentioning that it is free from all encumbrances, however, one FIR No.42/43 dated 18.05.2023, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station EOW Delhi Police was registered qua the same. It is alleged

**CRM-M-24689-2026 (O&M)****-2-**

that accused persons Sagar Tanwar (present applicant), Rajeev Anand, Amit Lohiya, Naresh Tanwar alongwith other co-accused, after hatching criminal conspiracy and in order to alienate the property in question, i.e. Plot No.3504, DLF Phase-IV, Gurugram, in an illegal manner, prepared forged documents and Rajeev Anand impersonated as Sumer Chand Jain (father of Sagar Jain) and Sagar Tanwar impersonated as Sagar Jain and got prepared transfer deed No.14 in the name of Sagar Jain in the Tehsil Wazirabad on 03.04.2023 and then the accused Sagar Jain @ Sagar Tanwar alongwith co-accused Naresh Tanwar got prepared power of attorney in favour of Rakesh Babu and Virender Rathi. It is also alleged that the accused persons grabbed Rs.76,56,200/- from Rakesh Babu and others, and tried to get registered sale deed in favour of Rakesh Babu and Virender Rathi on 28.07.2023, which was noticed by the concerned Naib Tehsildar who lodged the complaint against the petitioner and co-accused(s).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no incriminating material against him which would connect him with the alleged offence. He further submits that there is a delay of more than 07 months in registration of the FIR and nothing has been recovered from the petitioner. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 01 month and 08 days. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as only 04 out of 21 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

4. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He, upon instructions, submits



CRM-M-24689-2026 (O&M)

-3-

that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 01 month and 08 days. He, upon instructions, submits that only 04 out of 21 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 01 month and 08 days and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as only 04 out of 21 cited prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

May 07, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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