IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-29389-2026
Date of decision: 22.05.2026

SANJEEV PARASHAR AND ANOTHER ......Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA ....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

*****

Present: - Mr. Naresh K. Chhokar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana
(Through Video Conferencing).

Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate for the complainant.

*****

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have filed the instant first petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023, for the grant of pre-arrest bail in case bearing FIR No. 17 dated 30.01.2026 registered under Sections 120-B and 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Faridabad Central, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. The above FIR had been registered on the complaint of Shashi Sankhla, wife of Shri D.C. Sankhla, R/o H.No.27, Rajpura Road, Civil Lines, Delhi, through her power of attorney holder, D.C. Sankhla, against the present applicants-accused Sanjeev Parashar and Rekha Parashar, along with other co-accused, for committing cheating, fraud and misuse of non-

judicial papers, etc. Complainant alleged that she, along with her husband, was interested in investing in real estate, and they came across a property bearing no. A-27, Parklands, Sector-85, Faridabad (hereinafter referred to as 'property in question') through the present applicant-accused no.1 Sanjeev Parashar, who represented them that the property in question was existing in the name of his wife, Rekha Parashar (present applicant-accused no.2), and that she was willing to sell the same. In July 2019, the present applicants-accused nos. 1 and 2 and their son, Tushar Parashar, visited the complainant's residence at Civil Lines, Delhi. After discussion and negotiation, the complainant agreed to purchase the 1st floor with the roof rights of the property in question for a total consideration of Rs.1,40,00,000/-. Complainant further alleged that out of Rs.1,40,00,000/-, she made a total payment of Rs.1 crore, i.e. Rs. 20 lakhs through RTGS on 17.08.2019; Rs.40 lakhs through RTGS on 07.11.2020 and Rs.40 lakhs through RTGS on 11.01.2021 in favour of applicants-accused and their son Tushar Parashar. The applicants-accused, along with their son, also handed over the original title documents of the property in question, and it was mutually agreed that the balance amount of Rs.40 lakhs would be paid at the time of execution and registration of the sale deed in favour of the complainant.

3. Later, it also transpired that the petitioners-accused had also got registered another Agreement to Sell dated 20.09.2019 in favour of one Mahender Singh son of Shri Bhondu Ram, for selling the property in question for a sum of Rs. 2,65,00,000/- and they had also received a sum of Rs. 1,60,00,000/- from said Mahender. Another case, FIR No. 289 of 2025, was registered at Police Station Central, Faridabad, under Sections 420 and

120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and petitioner No.1 was arrested therein. It was further revealed that the petitioners had also mortgaged the property in question with UCO Bank, Delhi and had obtained a loan of Rs. 1,50,00,000/- and this fact was also concealed by the petitioners. Consequently, upon the said allegations, the FIR in question was registered.

4. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has vehemently argued that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the aforesaid case and they have no concern with the allegations levelled in the FIR. There are multiple civil disputes between the petitioners and the complainant. Moreover, four criminal complaints under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, have also been instituted by the complainant, which are pending before the Illaqa Magistrate at Delhi and notwithstanding the same, the present FIR has been registered. It is further argued that the son of the petitioners has already approached this Court for seeking quashing of the FIR vide CRM-M-9255-2026 on the ground that it has been registered after a period of 07 years. Further, the case is based on documentary evidence, and custodial interrogation of the petitioners would not be required. Counsel further contends that the complainant had also lodged a complaint on 02.06.2023 against the petitioners-accused regarding the misuse of stamp papers. An inquiry into the same was conducted by the Sub Divisional Officer, Faridabad and a report vide Serial No. 118/CC dated 25.07.2024 was submitted to the Deputy Commissioner wherein the Sub Divisional Officer, Faridabad submitted a report that the complainant did not produce any evidence to show that the petitioners had paid the amount for the stamp papers and that in the absence of any such evidence, it has to be assumed that the petitioners had purchased the stamp papers themselves.

Later, the said complaint was withdrawn by the complainant. It is argued that the dispute is predominantly civil in nature and that the petitioners, who are husband and wife, are entitled to the concession of pre-arrest bail.

5. Counsel for the respondent-State as well as Counsel for the complainant, contend that the petitioners have criminal antecedents and have concealed vital information from this Court about their criminal antecedents, notwithstanding that the High Court Rules and Orders specifically mandate every litigant to disclose their criminal antecedents. It is submitted that the factum of 06 more FIRs having been registered against the petitioners was mentioned in the order passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad; however, notwithstanding the same, the petitioners have mentioned in Para No. 15 of the present petition that no other criminal cases have been registered against them. They further contend that as many as 32 cases have been instituted under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act against the petitioners herein; hence, it is a regular *modus operandi* of the petitioners to indulge in deceitful transactions and thereafter siphon away money of innocent buyers/Investors. It is contended that the allegations levelled against the petitioners are serious. There is a pattern by which such transactions are being undertaken, showing that it is not a case of inadvertence and oversight but based on conscious design. The documents in question were executed while deliberately concealing the lien/mortgages created against the said property, as well as earlier agreements that had been executed by the petitioners with other buyers. It is argued that the petitioners herein, in collusion with other accused, lured the complainant to sell the property in question for a sum of Rs. 1.40 crores and received a sum of Rs. 1 crore through RTGS in three different transactions. They also executed

another agreement to sell on 20.09.2019, qua the same property in favour of one Mahender Singh son of Bhondu Ram, and received a sum of Rs. 1.60 crores from the said Mahender Singh and also obtained a loan of Rs. 1.50 crores from the UCO Bank against the said property.

6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and have gone through the documents appended along with the present petition.

7. In so far as the contention of the petitioners that the present petition has been filed after a considerable delay is concerned, I am of the opinion that the said delay might be relevant in certain cases. However, going through the mutual transactions that have been executed in the present case and the series of activities undertaken previously by the petitioners/accused qua the same property, wherein they not only entered into an agreement to sell with two persons and created a mortgage against the said property, but also obtained a loan from the Bank on account of the same, thus showing culpable mental state. Further, taking into consideration that 06 more FIRs have already been registered against the petitioners of which three are pending and one FIR has been instituted by the UCO Bank for recovery of the loan amount against the same property and also noticing that 32 other criminal complaints under the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 have instituted against the petitioners, shows that the petitioners are not new entrants in the field and it is not thereby some error. It is apparent that it was part of the secret plan of the petitioners by offering the same property for sale to multiple persons, and they had also obtained a loan thereupon, which clearly shows their criminal intent. The concealment of vital

information further reflects the malicious intent and the fraudulent and deceitful conduct of the petitioners herein.

8. Under the given circumstances, I am of the opinion that persons who have such antecedents and conduct do not deserve the indulgence of this Court. Consequently, the present petition is **dismissed.**

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

MAY 22, 2026
Vishal Sharma

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