

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:045388



(101) CRM-M-34949-2024 (O&M)
Decided on: 23.03.2026
Uploaded on: 23.03.2026

Gopal Khanna
.....Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab
.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner (s)
(Through V.C.).

Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jagan Nath Bhandari, Advocate for the complainant
(Through V.C.).

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. The petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.173 dated 26.05.2024 under Section 420 of IPC, registered at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar.
2. On 24.07.2024, the following order was passed:

“Petitioner Gopal Khanna has filed petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 173 dated 26.05.2024, under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code,

1860, registered at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar, Annexure P-1.

Learned counsel for petitioner argued that there is no change of location of plot which was earlier allotted to complainant and his mother. He is also ready to offer 2-3 other plots which the complainant and his mother can opt for and in alternate, he is also ready to return the entire money. He is ready for mediation.

Notice of motion.

On asking of this Court, Mr. Kewal Singh, Addl. A.G. Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State, who insisted that there is change of location of plot as detailed in complaint.

At this stage, Mr. Jagan Nath Bhandari, Advocate appeared on behalf of complainant and filed his power of attorney, which is taken on record. He argued that despite making entire payment to said concern, plot earlier allotted to him was sold to somebody else during the pendency of matter pending before Permanent Lok Adalat, Mohali. Execution is also pending before that Court.

At this stage, learned counsel for complainant stated that he is also ready for referring the matter to Mediation and Conciliation Centre.

Considering the matter in controversy, matter is referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court to explore the possibility of compromise. Parties are directed to appear before Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 31.07.2024 at 10:00 AM sharp.

To await report, adjourned to 23.09.2024.

In the meantime, arrest of petitioner is stayed till next date of hearing to explore the possibility of compromise.”

3. On 19.12.2025, the following order was passed:

“Learned Senior Counsel has handed over a demand draft No.319680 dated 06.10.2025 amounting to Rs.10 lacs to learned counsel for the complainant without prejudicing to the right of the complainant. It is submitted that total amount of Rs.1.35 crores was to be paid to the complainant as per the compromise. He submits that an amount of Rs.65 lacs has been

paid in cash, whereas, rest amount of Rs.60 lacs was paid through bank transaction. He relies upon the receipts appended with the petition and submits that total payment of Rs.1.35 crores has been made as per the compromise.

However, learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that though total disputed amount is of Rs.1.35 crores, however, amount of Rs.65 lacs, which as per the petitioner has been paid in cash, is factually incorrect.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, it is deciphered that the petitioner was granted interim protection vide order dated 24.07.2024 and the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. However, learned counsel for the complainant has accepted the demand draft of Rs.10 lacs without prejudice the rights of the complainant. As submitted before this Court, the dispute is only with regard to Rs.65 lacs, which is a subject matter of trial. Thus, the interim order dated 24.07.2024 is modified to the extent that in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall join investigation before the Investigating Agency/Officer. He shall abide by the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023:-

(i) That the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required to do so.

(ii) That the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer. (iii) That the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the court. Adjourned to 23.02.2026.”

4. Learned State counsel (on instructions from ASI Prashant Sharma) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and he is not required for custodial interrogation.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that allegations raised against the said petitioner are serious in nature and in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that he may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the witnesses and also the FIR-complainant. He has further submitted that the petitioner is involved in multiple FIRs. On these grounds, dismissal of the petition in hand is entreated for.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record; especially keeping in view the fact that FIR in question reflects a somewhat civil/property dispute, the petitioner has joined investigation & cooperated therein and not being sought by the State for custodial interrogation; the petitioner was granted interim protection by this Court vide orders dated 24.07.2024/19.12.2025 & there being no allegation of misuse against the petitioner; this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 19.12.2025.

7. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

8. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

9. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not

be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

23.03.2026
Naveen

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

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