



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

CRM-M-44844-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 10.02.2026

Pronounced on : 18.02.2026

Jasmer Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana & Anr.

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by : Mr. Arjunveer Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Ravinder Malik, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This is first petition for pre-arrest bail filed by the petitioner with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.558 dated 22.07.2025 under Sections 303, 324(4), 329(3) and 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Neelam Devi', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. She had submitted a complaint in writing addressed to SHO Police Station City Karnal. It was alleged by the above-named complainant that her husband 'Sham Lal' was missing since 05.02.2019, and that on 13.10.2011, her husband had entered into an agreement for the purchase of plot admeasuring 20x45 feet (total area 10 sq. yd) from Jasmer Singh (petitioner herein). As per complainant, the entire



sale consideration of the abovementioned plot, i.e. Rs.3,60,000/- was paid by the husband of complainant to Jasmer Singh, and that her husband had requested the vendor Jasmer Singh to execute the sale deed of the abovementioned plot on several occasions, but Jasmer Singh avoided the execution of sale deed, and kept on delaying the matter on one pretext or the other.

3. It was further stated by the complainant that since the entire sale consideration had been paid to Jasmer Singh, the possession of abovementioned plot was handed over by Jasmer Singh to the husband of complainant, and they had laid foundation of their house in the abovementioned plot. It was further stated that on 22.03.2023, building material was collected by Smt. Sushila on the disputed plot, and therefore, a complaint was filed before the police, which culminated into FIR No.25 dated 16.01.2023 under Sections 406, 420, and 34 of IPC.

4. As per complainant, in the Sessions Court when Jasmer Singh had applied for anticipatory bail, a statement was made by Jasmer Singh, to the effect that the agreement to sell executed by him in favour of Smt. Sushila was cancelled and an assurance was given by Jasmer Singh that he would execute the sale deed of the abovementioned plot either in favour of complainant or anybody else she wishes. As per complainant, Jasmer Singh had also promised to execute the Power of Attorney in favour of complainant, but subsequently Power of Attorney executed by Jasmer Singh was cancelled by him, without the consent of complainant.

5. In the backdrop of abovementioned facts, it was alleged by the complainant that in the intervening night of 21/22nd July, 2025, Jasmer Singh



visited the abovementioned plot at about 09:00 pm with an intention to take over its possession and when she rushed to the plot, she found that Jasmer Singh and one biker were taking away the gate fixed on the boundary wall of the abovementioned plot. According to complainant, when she objected to the abovementioned act of Jasmer Singh, Jasmer Singh threatened her to kill her, and her family members.

6. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned complaint, formal FIR of this case has been lodged and the investigation taken up.

7. Arguments addressed on behalf of all the parties have been heard.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration, for a decision: -

- i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that the maximum punishment prescribed for the commission of abovementioned offence is imprisonment upto seven years;
- iii) that the recovery of alleged stolen property has already taken place and therefore, nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- iv) that there is nothing on record to show that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is likely to produce a fruitful result;
- v) that that the investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future;



- vi) there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

10. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

11. In view of above-mentioned discussions, the present petition is hereby *allowed* and the petitioner is accorded the benefit of anticipatory bail. It is hereby directed that in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. The petitioner will join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

12. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

18.02.2026
Gaurav Thakur

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