



CRM-M-36589-2025

1

109

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

**CRM-M-36589-2025
DECIDED ON: 25.03.2026**

LAKHWINDER SINGH**.....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Fateh Saini, Advocate, for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.169, dated 20.06.2025, under Sections 406, 420 and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Mullana, District Ambala.

2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 15.07.2025, following order was passed:-

“2. The dispute in question is of a monetary nature. As per the allegations, an agreement to sell was entered into between one Harnek Singh (as purchaser) and Paramjit Singh (seller/complainant). The said deal was facilitated by a property dealer, namely Lakhwinder Singh (the present petitioner), at the instance of the seller, Paramjit Singh. The total sale consideration was fixed at Rs. 6 Crores. At the initial stage, a token amount of Rs. 50 lacs was paid by Harnek Singh to Paramjit Singh. However, upon mutual cancellation of the deal, the entire token amount was returned to the purchaser.

The issue raised in the impugned FIR pertains to the allegation that the property dealer (petitioner



herein) has not returned the commission amount of Rs. 25 lacs to the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this is clearly a case involving non-return of commission, which was admittedly paid to the petitioner by the complainant, Paramjit Singh, in accordance with the terms of the sale agreement. No criminal offence is made out on the face of the FIR. The FIR appears to have been lodged as an arm-twisting tactic to recover the commission amount, the entitlement to which, is yet to be established by the complainant.

Furthermore, it is submitted that the dispute is purely civil in nature and does not attract any criminal liability. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency, accordingly, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Notice of motion.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, Additional Advocate General, Haryana, and Mr. Fateh Saini, Advocate, appear on behalf of the respondent and the complainant, respectively.

4. If the petitioner and the complainant are willing to resolve the dispute amicably, both parties are directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 30.07.2025.

5. For awaiting report, list on 08.09.2025.

6. Till the next date of hearing, arrest of petitioner shall remain stayed.”

3. Learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant submits that petitioner acted as a mediator in a land deal involving 3 acres valued at Rs.6 crores, for which he received Rs.25 lacs as commission. When the deal fell through, petitioner failed to return the commission as agreed, despite a subsequent compromise to repay Rs.19,50,000/-, petitioner kept the funds. Therefore, petitioner is the sole and primary accused for illegally usurping the money. Thus, they jointly pray for dismissal of the present petition.

4. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it,



and is of the considered view that, at this stage, petitioner does not require custodial interrogation.

5. **Accordingly, present petition is allowed** and petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

6. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

7. It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

8. However, it is clarified that in case, petitioner has failed to join the investigation, prosecution as well as complainant are at liberty to move application for cancellation of the present bail order.

25.03.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>