

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026 PHHC:044263



(102-A)

CRM-M-54803-2024 (O&M)

Decided on: 20.03.2026

Uploaded on: 20.03.2026

Om Parkash and another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner (s).

Ms. Mahima Yashpal Singla, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ajay Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. The petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 in case bearing FIR No.513 dated 30.08.2023 under Sections 420 of IPC 1860 and Sections 419, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC added later on, registered at Police Station Gharaunda, District Karnal.

2. On 14.11.2024, the following order was passed:

“Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate, learned counsel representing the petitioner submitted that the bone of the contention in the present case is release deed dated 9.6.2000 and that as a matter of fact the complainant had earlier also agitated this issue by way of filing a complaint dated 31.5.2019 (Annexure P-4) earlier before the police and that the parties were called and a compromise was effected and the said complaint was withdrawn and wherein an amount of Rs.11 lakhs was paid through cheque to the complainant. It has thus been submitted

that, under these circumstances, the complainant by agitating the same issue again, which already stood compromised, is virtually abusing the process of law so as to arm twist the petitioner to extract more money.

At this stage, Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate, learned counsel representing the complainant has strongly disputed the aforesaid contention regarding compromise and has stated that no such compromise dated 31.5.2019 was ever effected amongst the parties with regard to the release deed in question.

Learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for the complainant expressed that there could be some chances of an amicable settlement.

The petitioners as well as the complainant shall appear before the Secretary, District Legal Services Authority at Karnal on 29.11.2024 at 10:00 A.M .

The Secretary, District Legal Services Authority at Karnal shall refer the parties to some seasoned Mediator so as to probe the possibility of compromise.

List again on 14.2.2025.

Meanwhile, the petitioners be not arrested.

A copy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.”

3. The mediation proceedings were initiated between the rival private parties, but the same did not fructify.
4. Learned State counsel (on instructions from SI Mahesh) has submitted that the petitioners have joined investigation but their custodial interrogation is required for disclosing the whereabouts/details of other persons involved in the alleged crime.
5. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioners are serious in nature and in case the petitioners are extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the

likelihood that they may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the witnesses and also the FIR-complainant.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record; especially keeping in view the factum of the petitioners having joined investigation & cooperated therein and their custodial interrogation being sought for disclosing the whereabouts/details of other persons involved in the alleged crime; this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 14.11.2024.

7. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

8. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioners violate any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

9. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

20.03.2026
Naveen

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

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