



142

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

**CRM-M No.53962 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 11.03.2026**

**Harpreet Singh Maan**

**..... Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana**

**..... Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

**\*\*\*\*\***

Present: Mr. S. S. Swaich, Advocate and  
Mr. Gurminder S. Salana, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Bishnoi, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**\*\*\*\*\***

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present third petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.199, dated 01.06.2024, under Sections 406, 420, 506 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Harguneet Singh, who has alleged that he had transferred an amount of Rs.5 lacs through bank account of his mother in the bank account of the petitioner for the purchase of a plot. However, the petitioner, alongwith co-accused, namely, Trilochan Singh Mann got registered a plot of land measuring 290 square yards for an amount of Rs.5 lacs. However, neither possession of the plot was handed over to the complainant nor his money was returned and,



thus, the FIR got registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the investigating agencies collected various evidences against the petitioner and on completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The learned trial Court, on framing of the charges, commenced with the trial. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 05.07.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 08.09.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court twice praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-61606-2024 and CRM-M-31343-2025, however the same were dismissed vide orders dated 25.02.2025 and 04.07.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present third petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that from the allegations made, it is apparent that the dispute otherwise is of a civil nature. He has submitted that the petitioner was arrested on 05.07.2024 on the allegation that he after having received an amount of Rs.5 Lakhs as earnest money, has not handed over the possession. He has submitted that the sale deed has already been executed in favour of the mother of complainant. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 1½ years. He has submitted that the co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Tarlochan Singh, has already been granted the



concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 14.10.2024 passed in CRM-M-32292-2024. He has thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the complainant was cheated by the petitioner in conspiracy with the co-accused. He has submitted that the complainant paid an amount of Rs.5 Lakhs but even after executing the sale deed, the possession of the same was not delivered to the complainant. He has submitted that even the compromise was arrived between the parties for giving the complainant another plot but the petitioner and the co-accused have backed out from the compromise arrived at between the parties as well. He has submitted that no case for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out and, thus, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has endorsed the fact that co-accused in the present case, who is none other than the brother of the petitioner, has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far. He has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, who is involved in 10 other cases.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the dispute between the parties is regarding the handing over the possession of the plot in question to the complainant. The co-accused, namely, Tarlochan Singh, has already been granted the concession



of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 14.10.2024. Custody certificate earlier produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 06 months and 08 days as on 12.01.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 18 more cases, in 09 of the cases, he is on bail and in 04 cases, he has been acquitted. Out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined so far.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

10. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

11.03.2026

*rittu*

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No