



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

103

CRM-M-49441-2025
Decided on : 16.02.2026

Sandeep Singh @ Seepa

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner – Sandeep Singh @ Seepa, has filed instant petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, for seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 223, dated 06.08.2025, under Sections 318(4) and 338 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. The FIR in the instant case has been registered at the instance of the complainant – Paramjit Kaur, alleging therein that a plot, earlier owned by the petitioner Sandeep Singh @ Seepa, had been sold to her for lawful consideration. However, after payment of said consideration to the petitioner, when the complainant visited the spot, some other persons came and interfered with her possession, categorically stating that the plot did not belong to her.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner is ready



to refund an amount of Rs.4,40,000/-; however, till date, nothing has been paid to the respondent/complainant. From the record, it is noticed that an agreement to sell was executed on 13.11.2024 by the petitioner in favour of the complainant in respect of a plot measuring 200 sq. yards, being 6-2/3/211, measuring 0 Kanal 6/2/3 Marlas (200 sq. yards), out of land measuring 10 Kanal 11 Marlas, situated in village Jandawala, Tehsil and District Bathinda.

Agreement to sell reflects that the petitioner had agreed to sell the plot at the rate of Rs.10,300/- per square yard, thereby making the total sale consideration of Rs.20,60,000/-. An amount of Rs.12,00,000/- was paid as earnest money by the respondent-complainant to the petitioner at the time of execution of the agreement to sell. However, when the sale deed was executed in favour of the complainant on 11.02.2025, the sale consideration mentioned therein was only Rs.4,40,000/-.

4. Since, complainant could not obtain possession of the said plot, the present FIR came to be registered. Learned counsel alleges that petitioner, in connivance with another person, namely, Rana Randeep Singh, committed fraud, as the said person also received money from the complainant for execution of the sale deed in the presence of witnesses Harbans Singh Brar and Jaspal Singh.

From the record, it is further noticed that the petitioner – Sandeep Singh @ Seepa had initially purchased the same plot on 08.10.2024 from one Atma Ram for a total consideration of Rs.4,40,000/-. Thereafter, within a short span of time, he entered into an agreement to sell with the present complainant and subsequently executed the sale deed in her favour



on 11.02.2025, i.e., after about four months.

Thus, while both the sale deeds reflect the price as Rs.4,40,000/-, the agreement to sell indicates a total sale consideration of Rs.20,60,000/-. It has also surfaced during police inquiry that an amount of Rs.20,60,000/- was received by the petitioner from the complainant, yet possession of the plot was not handed over to her.

5. In order to balance the equities, an opportunity was granted to the petitioner on 15.01.2026, and the matter was adjourned to 16.02.2026, i.e., for today.

6. Petitioner has failed to make any payment, even of Rs.4,40,000/- as reflected in the sale deed, and has not furnished any satisfactory explanation with regard to the agreement to sell. The police inquiry further indicates receipt of Rs.20,60,000/- by him from the complainant. Thus, the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands and is not entitled to discretionary relief under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023.

Accordingly, instant petition stands **dismissed**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 16, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No