



CRM-M-26705-2026

1

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

205

CRM-M-26705-2026
Decided on :29.05.2026

Anil Kumar @ Anil

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Shiv Charan Bhola, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 0378 dated 15.06.2025, under Sections 420, 120-B IPC (Sections 318(4)/61(2) of BNS) [Sections 423, 467, 468 and 471 IPC (Sections 322, 338, 336(3), 340 of BNS) were added later on], registered at Police Station HTM Hisar, District Hisar.
2. On the basis of the complaint made by the complainant, namely Satyaparkash, son of late Sh. Dwarkadas, FIR in question has been registered with the following allegations:

“ The complainant alleged to be Secretary of Haryana Kurukshetra Gaushala, Hisar. The land comprised in Khasra No.89//18/2 min total land 14 Marla, situated at Mirzapur Road, Hisar owned and possessed by Haryana Kurukshetra Gaushala,



Hisar since more than 48 years. On 3.11.2024, when the boundary wall of Gaushala was being constructed, then one Anand came at the spot and asked to stop the work of boundary wall by claiming that he alongwith others is owner of the said land as per registered sale deed. On 6.11.2024, the said Anand alongwith other assailants again visited at the spot and threatened the workers of Gushala. On 10.11.2024, Anand alongwith Sham Sunder, Mukesh and other persons came at the spot and forcibly spread the Bajri with the help of JCB Machine over the disputed land. It was further submitted that the land measuring 31 Marla has been purchased by Gulzari Mal son of Mohan Lal, resident of village Barwa, District Hisar in the year 1970 and 14 Marla land has been given by him to Haryana Kurukshetra Gaushala, Hisar for cultivation and since then, the said land is in the possession of Gaushala, as per jamabandi for the year 1974-1975. However, after the death of Gulzari Lal in the year 2007, the land measuring 31 Marla has been transferred fraudulently in the name Anil as per sale deed No.7992 dated 4.09.2012 by the said Anand etc., who has been duly identified by the present petitioner. The said Anil further transferred the said land in the names of Krishna etc. as per sale deeds No.5619 dated 2.09.2013, who transferred the same in the name of Balwnti Devi, vide sale deed No.11436 dated 29.03.2019 and lastly, the said land has been transferred, vide sale deed No 7687 dated 18.08.2021 in the names of Krishna etc.. In this manner, the petitioner was involved in the said cheating by identifying the first vendee namely Anil Kumar son of Satbir Singh.”

After registration of case, investigation was started and thereon petitioner was arrested on 20.09.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that role attributed to the petitioner is limited to the allegation that, after the death of Gulzari Lal in the year 2007, land measuring 31 marlas was allegedly purchased fraudulently by petitioner-Anil Kumar @ Anil, vide sale deed



No. 7992 dated 04.09.2012. It is further alleged that thereafter petitioner transferred the said land in favour of Krishan vide sale deed No. 5619 dated 02.09.2013, and subsequently through sale deed No. 11436 dated 29.03.2019 in favour of Balwanti Devi and sale deed No. 7687 dated 18.08.2021 in favour of Krishan etc

4. Learned counsel further contends that petitioner was a bona fide purchaser of the land vide sale deed No. 7992 dated 04.09.2012 and, being the lawful owner at the relevant time, subsequently transferred the same in favour of Krishan. It is also argued that allegations have been raised after an inordinate delay of about 13 years. Petitioner is in custody since 20.09.2021 and nothing remains to be recovered from his possession. Since trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail and submits that petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and has played an active role in the fraudulent transfer of the disputed property. It is contended that despite having knowledge regarding the death of Gulzari Lal in the year 2007, petitioner dishonestly purchased the land vide sale deed No. 7992 dated 04.09.2012 and thereafter further transferred the same through different sale deeds in favour of Krishan and Balwanti Devi with an intention to give legitimacy to the illegal transaction.

Learned State counsel further submits that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature involving cheating, forgery and

**CRM-M-26705-2026****4**

fraudulent transfer of property, and matter pertains to a well-planned conspiracy. It is also submitted that the trial is at a crucial stage and, in case the petitioner is released on bail, there is every likelihood that he may influence the witnesses or tamper with the prosecution evidence. Accordingly, prayer is made for dismissal of the present petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

7. Considering the fact that petitioner is stated to be in custody since 20.09.2025, that investigation in the present case stands completed and challan has already been presented, and that out of 13 cited prosecution witnesses none has been examined so far, this Court is of the view that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, petitioner is held entitled to the concession of regular bail.

Consequently, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.



CRM-M-26705-2026

5

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

29.05.2026

Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*