



CRM-M-44671-2025

1

139

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

CRM-M-44671-2025

Date of decision : 25.02.2026

Karamveer @ Karamvir

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Naresh K. Chhokar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana assisted by
ASI Kuldeep Singh.

Mr. Sandeep Majithia, Advocate for the complainant
(through V.C.).

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.0072 dated 13.02.2024, under Sections 406, 420 read with Section 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Sector-8, Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant-Satpal. It was alleged that on 01.03.2021 he had executed an agreement to sell of land measuring 300 square yards with Premwati wife of Karamvir (petitioner) for a sale consideration of Rs.43 lakhs. It was alleged that out of the said amount, an amount of Rs.13,50,000/- was paid to Premwati on 01.03.2021 for execution of the sale deed which was scheduled on 28.2.2022 and the remaining amount would be paid at the time of registry and it was mentioned in the agreement that the said land was free from all encumbrances. However, on 02.05.2021 Premwati died and after that Karamvir and his sons pressurized the complainant for remaining payment

**CRM-M-44671-2025****2**

on the pretext of dire need of money and threatened that, otherwise they would sell the plot to some other person. Thereafter, the complainant paid Rs.25 lakhs on 04.08.2021 in the bank account of Karamvir with the consent of his three sons and sale deed was agreed to be executed on 04.11.2021. However, lateron, they refused to get the sale deed executed and date was extended to 04.01.2022. On 04.01.2022, they again refused to get the sale deed executed by saying that they had already given possession of the plot to him. It was further alleged that upon received a notice from IIFL Home Finance Ltd., complainant got to know that all three sons of Karamvir along with Karamvir and Premavati took a loan of Rs.45 lakhs in the year 2019 on the said plot. The complainant also came to know that Karamvir had executed two transfer deeds in the name of his wife i.e. Transfer Deed no.1688 dated 15.6.2017 and Transfer Deed no.5994 dated 25.9.2018 which was used for taking loan from IIFL Bank, before selling the said plot to him, wherein it was mentioned that the title of property was clean in every way and did not have any liability/loan and thus, they committed fraud of Rs.40,50,000/- with the complainant and gave possession of the plot which was mortgaged with the bank and same was put into auction by the Bank. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented and on framing of the charges, trial commenced. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad praying for grant of bail. However, on hearing counsel for both the sides, the same was declined vide order dated 29.07.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition filed praying for grant of bail.



3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner along with his three sons have been prosecuted in the present case. He submits that though there is a transaction of Rs.25.00 lacs in the account of the petitioner, however, the same has been used by his sons. He submits that the petitioner is 77 years of age and has no complicity, as alleged. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and thus, he deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submission made on behalf of the petitioner and submitted that the complainant had given an amount of Rs.40,50,000/- to the petitioner. He submits that the complicity of the petitioner is more than that of his sons. However, he does not deny the fact that sons of the petitioner, are already on bail.

5. Status report by way of affidavit of Mr. Jitesh Kumar, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Ballabgarh has been filed on behalf of respondent-State in the Court today, same is taken on record.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the complicity of the petitioner surfaced during investigation. He submits that in the account of the petitioner, there is a transaction of Rs.25 lacs. He, on instructions from ASI Kuldeep Singh, has submitted that investigation is complete and challan has been filed, however, the case is fixed before the trial Court for framing of charges. He has further submitted that out of total 04 accused, rest 03 accused are on bail. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.



CRM-M-44671-2025

4

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 05.07.2025. Petitioner along with his three sons have been prosecuted in the present FIR. Out of total 04 accused, rest 03 accused, who are none other than his son, are already on bail. Investigation is already complete. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 07 months and 20 days as on 24.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25.02.2026

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

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