



CRM-M-53403-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-53403-2025
Decided on: 17.02.2026

Mandeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Supriya Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr, DAG Haryana

Mr. Naveen Anand, complainant in person

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.168 dated 14.06.2021, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at PS Mahesh Nagar, District Ambala.

2. On 01.12.2025, following order was passed:

"i) Before proceeding further, this Court has noticed that FIR in the present case was registered on 14.06.2021, and as pointed out by learned State counsel, no final report has been submitted by the Investigating Officer till date. It is only after the arrest of one of the accused, namely Manjeet Singh, that his disclosure statement was recorded, on the basis of which petitioner's alleged involvement in the case has now surfaced.

ii) After hearing preliminary arguments on 22.09.2025, notice was accepted by the learned State counsel. However, no substantive steps have been taken by the Investigating Officer until today to arrest the petitioner. It appears that the Investigating Agency has been extremely lethargic, especially considering that



CRM-M-53403-2025

the dispute primarily pertains to documentary evidence—namely, the sale deed dated 05.12.1978 and the signatures, if any, affixed upon it by the respective parties.

iii) On oral request of learned counsel for the petitioner, complainant-Naveen Anand s/o Kasturi Lal Anan, resident of 6/1 Dayal Bagh, Mahesh Nagar, Ambala Haryana is hereby ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.

Let amended memo of parties be filed in the Registry within in two days without moving any separate application.

iv) Notice to the newly added respondent No.2.

Mr. Naveen Anand-complainant is present-in-person in Court and seeks time to file response.

v) Learned State counsel is directed to file a status report along with details of the progress made in the investigation by the next date of hearing.

vi) In view of the above, further proceedings are deferred to 17.02.2026.

vii) Meanwhile, petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, petitioner shall be released on interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. Petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

viii) 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.

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

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance to the directions issued by this Court vide order dated 01.12.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation. Moreover, the allegations are to be proved through the documentary proof, therefore, custodial interrogation would not help any meaningful purpose.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that though the investigation has been joined, but the petitioner has not cooperated fully during investigation. On being asked by the Court, as to what kind of cooperation is expected from the petitioner or what are the remaining aspects, need to be unearth



CRM-M-53403-2025

with the help of petitioner, learned State counsel submits that names of other co-accused persons, involved in the alleged fraud need to be identified and same are in the knowledge of the present petitioner. However, he has not disclosed any such name.

Such an objection is neither here nor there without a specific reason or a particular suspect being identified in the case. Moreover, it is noticed that Gurwinder Singh, who got registered the FIR, himself is absconding and the investigating officer/investigating agency, under the suspension of the Superintendent of Police, Ambala has failed to apprehend said accused, and then to interrogate him, despite the FIR being registered way back on 14.06.2021.

5 The complainant, who is appearing in person also objects the prayer and submits that, petitioner should not be granted the concession of bail. He contends that because of the fraud played by all these accused, including the petitioner, he was initially involved in the case as accused and was arrested at first instance, though he was released on the same day.

6. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsels for the parties.

7. Admittedly, the dispute pertains to a plot measuring 96 sq. yards, which was ultimately found to be owned by one Shashi Anand, who is also present before the Court, alongwith her husband namely, Naveen Anand. Although they may have been picked up by the investigating agency, based on initial suspicion, however, as of now they are not classified as accused in any manner. If they feel aggrieved, they are free to avail themselves of remedies available in law. As far as joining of the investigation by the petitioner is concerned, it is admitted that he has been joined, though not to the satisfaction of the concerned State counsel. In the

**CRM-M-53403-2025**

absence of any plausible reason addressed or highlighted before the Court, specifically the reason of pressurizing the petitioner to disclose certain information, the interim relief, which has already been granted, can not be taken back, in ordinary course. However, the allegations are yet to be established, by proving charges beyond doubt. Involvement of petitioner, if any, in any other case, of similar nature, would be the aspect looked into by the trial Court, while taking final decision and as per the evidence, which is adduced before it.

8. Taking into consideration all the aforementioned circumstances, the petitioner is not a direct beneficiary, as there was no sale deed ever executed in his favour, nor any amount was found credited in his account, and he has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 01.12.2025 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

9. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

10. However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

11. It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

17.02.2026

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:**YES/NO
~~YES~~/NO**