



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

236

CRM-M-34309-2026

Date of decision : 01.07.2026

Date of uploading : 01.07.2026

Dinesh

.....Petitioner

Versus**State Of Haryana**

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chhokar, Advocate and
Mr. Ram Bhati, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.29 dated 29.01.2026 under Sections 318(4), 319, 336(3), 338, 340, 61(2), 238(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Gannaur, District Sonipat.

2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

"A complaint No. 10-5PII dated 13.01.2026 received in the Office of Assistant Police Commissioner Gannaur for the purpose to register a case, the contents of complaint is as under:- To, ACP, Police Station Gannaur, District Sonipat. Subject:- Complaint to take legal action against the accused persons. 1. Parmod Kumar son of Karam Singh resident of Nasirpur Bangar, District Sonipat, 2. Balbir Singh son of Ram Kishan resident of Pillu Khera, District Jind, 3. Parveen Kumar son of Sajjan resident of Village Baroda, Tehsil Gohana, District Sonipat, 4. Ravinder son of Daya Kishan resident of Village Baen, Tehsil Gannaur, District Sonipat, 5. Vinay Kumar, Deed Writer, Sonipat. Sir, That applicant Vikas Kumar Padia son of Late Sh. Bhagwan Padia resident of House No. 127, 2nd Floor, BJ Block, Shalimar Bagh, Pachhim Delhi and believing in the law and order system and requested to you as under:- That my Firm i.e. Spaj Estate Private Limited purchased the 36 Kanals of land through two Sale Deeds, out of which one Sale Deed No.1666 dated 24.06.2011



pertaining to 12 Kanals 16 Marla and 2nd Sale Deed No. 1665 pertaining to 23 Kanals 4 Marlas with of Khewat No. 220, Khata No. 200, Rectangle No. 10//184-16, 198-0 and Khewat No. 221, Khata No. 201, 202 Rectangle, Killa No. 9//168-0, 25/47-4, 10//208-0 which is belong to Village Bean, Tehsil Ganaur, District Sonipat from the time of purchasing this land, I am having possession over there. One Ajay Jain son of Jugminder Jain is looking after the above said land. I also used to visit over there. In December, 2025, I had taken the Tubewell connection and maintained my land and constructed a room on the land. 2. That on 10.01.2026, on Saturday, my known Ajay Jain received a Phone call on his Mobile No. 8470004847 from one Rajpal having Mobile No.9868066804 saying that the land which is look after by him, has already been sold. Thereafter, Ajay Jain called me telephonically and narrated all the incident. Thereafter, on the next day i.e. on Sunday, I came to my land and met with Ajay Jain and tried to find out the fake Sale Deed. On account of holiday on Sunday, thereafter, today i.e. on 12.01.2026, we came to the Ganaur Tehsil and checked the documents then we know to surprise that the aforementioned accused persons in- connivance of each other committed forgery and fraudulently issued Farzi Authority Letter in the name of our Firm and affixed the forged signatures of me and Ajita Aggarwal, Meenu Sarvogi as a Director and executed the Sale Deed having bearing No. 3649 dated 27.11.2025 and fraudulently sold. That the above said accused Parmod Kumar son of Karam Singh resident of Nasirpur fraudulently get forged Authority Letter in his name and sold the land to accused Balbir Singh son of Ram Kishan and accused as a witness Parveen Kumar son of Sajjan and Ravinder son of Daya Singh inconnivance of each other while preparing forged documents and illegally sold the land. Hence, it is requested that necessary strict legal action may kindly be taken against the accused persons. Thanking you, Dated 12.01.2026. Applicant Sd/- Vikas Kumar Padia son of Late Sh. Bhagwan Padia resident of House No. 127, 2nd Floor, BJ Block, Shalimar Bagh, Pachhim Delhi, Mobile No. 9999977739, complaint No. 10-5PII dated 13.01.2026. Police proceedings.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 15.03.2026. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that, assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version is taken to be correct, the petitioner, who is a deed writer, is alleged to have primarily helped the co-accused in uploading the deed in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that, upon culmination of investigation qua the petitioner, the challan has already been presented *qua* the petitioner. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is a young man aged about 29 years and is the sole breadwinner of his family. Learned counsel has further urged that the petitioner has clean



antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 24.06.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 15.03.2026 wherein after investigation was carried out and challan stands presented on 30.05.2026. Total 24 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date. It is thus indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised by learned counsel give rise to debatable issues which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 24.06.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 03 months and 10 days & is not shown to be involved in any other case.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

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



ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

01.07.2026
jatin

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No