



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

104

**CRM-M No.56689 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:09.03.2026**

Gurmeet Singh @ Lucky

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Himanshu Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gopal Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, hereinafter being referred to as 'IPC' only, the FIR No.16 dated 12.01.2023, has been lodged in Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar Mohali. In the above mentioned case, the petitioner is apprehending arrest, and therefore, for the benefit of anticipatory bail he has approached this Court, by virtue of present petition under Section 482 of 'Bharatiya Nagrik Surakhsa Sanhita 2023', hereinafter being referred to as 'BNSS' only.

2. In nut-shell the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Ranbir Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the above named



complainant that his son 'Amit', an Advocate by profession, had received a call on his phone from Balram, a property dealer, who told him that a property located in A.K.S. Colony Zirakpur, was available for sale, and that the above said property would be a good investment to earn handsome profits. According to complainant his son 'Amit' visited the office of 'Balram' where 'Gurmeet' (petitioner herein) and 'Dinesh' met him and told that plot belongs to 'Baljit Singh' son of 'Avtar' and aunty of 'Gurmeet'. The complainant further alleged that a deal was struck for the sale of above mentioned plot and as a token money a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- was paid to 'Baljit Singh' on 13.07.2022. According to complainant later on 15.07.2022, Rs.15,00,000/- were paid to 'Baljit Singh', and thus a total amount of Rs.25,00,000/- had been received by 'Baljit Singh' for the sale of above mentioned plot. According to complainant later on it was found that above mentioned plot did not exist at all and they had been cheated.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above mentioned complaint formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is innocent, who has has been falsely implicated in the present case. As per learned counsel for the petitioner the petitioner is neither a beneficiary of the above mentioned deal nor he received any benefit from the same. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the only allegations against the petitioner are of introducing the son of complainant



with 'Baljit Singh' to whom money has been paid.

6. The learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel, the petitioner is the main conspirator in the commission of offence, and that, in fact, he is a member of a syndicate, and that the petitioner had played a pivotal role in the commission of crime, and therefore, his custodial interrogation is necessary.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of the record shows that there are several factors which are required to be taken into consideration at this stage. Those factors are:-

- i) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;
- ii) that the maximum punishment prescribed for the commission of offence is imprisonment up to 7 years;
- iii) that the petitioner is neither owner nor seller nor witness to the alleged agreement to sell;
- iv) that no money has been received by the petitioner;
- v) that the investigation and trial of the case are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the prosecution witnesses; and



viii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the trial.

9. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

10. In view of above-mentioned discussions, the present petition is hereby **allowed** and the petitioner is accorded the benefit of anticipatory bail. It is hereby directed that in the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. The petitioner will join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer. He shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

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

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

09.03.2026
Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No