

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103-2

CRM-M-54284-2025(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 5th March, 2026

Jai Singh

Versus

.... Petitioner

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

* * *

Present : Mr.Manoj Kumar Taya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr.Jaswinder Singh Rana, Advocate for the complainant.

* * *

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 First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jai Singh	365	11.10.2024	420, 467, 468 & 471 IPC	Butana	Karnal

2.

On 24.09.2025, following order was passed:-

“i) Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, seeking anticipatory bail in relation to FIR No.365 dated 11.10.2024, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC at Police Station Butana, District Karnal



ii) *Matu Ram had three sons and four daughters, namely: Neki Ram (son), Maya Ram (son), Sarupa (son), and daughters Nandi, Chauhi Devi, Jiwani, and Sarupi. The petitioner, Jai Singh, along with his brothers, who are sons of Neki Ram, obtained a relinquishment deed executed in their favor by Nandi, Chauhi Devi, Jiwani, and Sarupi, dated 2005.*

iii) *Allegations against the petitioner and other co-accused have been made by the son of Maya Ram (the petitioner's cousin), claiming that Jiwani and Nandi had passed away prior to 2005, yet the relinquishment deed is dated 2005. It is therefore alleged that the deed is forged and that the land was transferred by the petitioner and co-accused through impersonation of the true owners, Nandi and Jiwani. Counsel argues that the land had actually been transferred much earlier by Maya Ram himself, by executing a sale deed dated 16.06.1982 (P-3).*

iv) *Counsel further submits that the dispute is primarily based on documentary evidence, which can be resolved, therefore, custodial interrogation is not necessary to reach at a conclusion.*

v) *Notice of motion for 13.11.2025.*

vi) *Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, appears on behalf of the respondent/State.*

vii) *Learned State counsel is directed to file a status report addressing the contentions raised by the petitioner and providing a response to the allegations, supported by evidence.*

viii) *Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner's joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondents..”*



3. Continuing the submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that apart from the dispute being of civil nature, there is another development in the case that all the accused in the case and the complainant party have entered into a compromise and have resolved their all disputes. Resultantly, one quashing petition i.e. CRM-M-65215-2025 has been instituted and after issuance of directions dated 19.11.2025, statements of the parties to support the contention of compromise, have already been recorded before the Court below.

4. On the other hand, learned Assistant Advocate General and the learned counsel representing the complainant Mr.Jaswinder Singh Rana also support the contention of the petitioner and also that the statements regarding the compromise being genuine have already been recorded before the Trial Court.

5. In view of the fact that a compromise has already been effected between the parties and the statements in this regard have also been recorded before the Trial Court, there is no justification for custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

6. Hence, petition is allowed. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today or as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

7. 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.

March 05, 2026

gian

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>