



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

CRM-M-33371-2026

Date of Decision:09.06.2026

Amar Kesh Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Rakesh Nehra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Ram Kumar Saini, Advocate
Mr. Pranjal P. Chaudhary, Advocate
Mr. Ankit Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.120, dated 31.05.2026, under Sections 318(4), 335, 338,336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) of B.N.S, 2023, {corresponding Sections 420,464,467,468,471 and 120-B of IPC} registered at Police Station Sector-31, Faridabad, District Faridabad.

2. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the present F.I.R has been got registered by Pooja Singh, complainant, who claimed herself to be the owner of the shops No.240 and 241, situated at SRS Tower, Sector-31, Faridabad. She lodged the FIR by alleging that a person namely Kailash Chandra Sharma was asserting the rights over the said property on the basis of certain documents, which were apparently forged. He further submits that she suspected that Kailash Chandra Sharma had forged the certain documents in collusion with the present petitioner and certain other

co-accused. However, the averments made by the complainant in the FIR were factually incorrect. Learned senior counsel vehemently argued that in fact, the present petitioner is only working as General Manager of the Maintenance Agency of a project SRS tower, where the complainant owns the said units. As per the knowledge of the present petitioner and the records of SRS towers, both units No.240 and 241 still stand in the name of Pooja Singh, complainant and even the petitioner does not dispute the said fact. Learned counsel further submits that in fact, the present FIR is a counterblast to the FIR No.245 dated 02.12.2025 under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340, 351(2) and 61 of B.N.S., 2023, which was got registered by the present petitioner against the complainant of the present case. He further submits that in fact, the stand taken by the complainant in the present case is apparently false in view of the affidavit (Annexure P-4) and Annexure A-1 of the said affidavit, which were submitted by the present petitioner before the National Company Law Tribunal, Chandigarh. He further submits that the said affidavit was got prepared and notarised by the present petitioner on 21.05.2026 i.e. 10 days prior to the registration of the FIR and as per the said affidavit also, the petitioner had shown the complainant to be owner of Units No.240 and 241, which are subject matter of the present FIR. Learned senior counsel further submits that even admittedly the payment of Rs.15,00,000/- was made by Kailash Chandra Sharma, alleged victim to one Rakesh Kumar and not to present petitioner. Thus, it has been wrongly shown that the petitioner had connived with Rakesh Kumar, just to defraud Kailash Chandra Sharma and the present complainant. Learned senior counsel further submits that entire case is based on documentary evidence, which has already been collected by the police and the custodial

interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Abhimanyu Antil, DAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Nitin Bhanwala, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of complainant by filing his Vakalatnama, which is taken on record and have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that by forging certain documents, the petitioner in collusion with Rakesh Kumar and others had tried to challenge the valid title of the complainant over the units. However, they could not dispute the fact that no amount has been transferred in the accounts of the present petitioner and rather the cheque of Rs.15,00,000/- was also issued in the favour Rakesh Kumar only and not in favour of the present petitioner. Even, admittedly documents have already been collected by the police, during the course of investigation.

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

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner had not executed any document in favour of Kailash Chandra Sharma, alleged victim and the amount of Rs.15,00,000/- was also paid by way of cheques to Kailash Chandra Sharma in favour of Rakesh Kumar. Whether the petitioner had disputed the title of complainant over units No.240 and 241 is yet to be proved by the complainant by leading evidence before the Trial Court and in the considered opinion of the Court, at this stage, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

7. In view of above discussion, the present petition is allowed and

the petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Sections 482 (2) of B.N.S.S. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join the investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

09.06.2026
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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