



CRM-M-55398-2025 and other cases

1

101 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55398-2025
Date of decision: 25.03.2026

HUSHANPREET KHAN ALIAS KALU KHAN ...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR ...RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-59551-2025

JAMEEL KHAN ...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR ..RESPONDENTS

CRM-M-2451-2026

DULLA KHAN ...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR ..RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present: None for the petitioner.
(in CRM-M-55398-2025 and CRM-M-59551-2025)

Mr. M.K.Dhot, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-2451-2026)

Mr. P.S.Pandher, Asst. A.G.Punjab.

H.S.GREWAL,J. (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of three petitions bearing CRM-M-55398-2025, CRM-M-59551-2025 and CRM-M-2451-2026 as these are arising out of the same FIR. For brevity, the facts are being taken from CRM-M-55398-2025.

These petitions have been filed by the petitioners seeking

**CRM-M-55398-2025 and other cases****2**

anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS in case FIR No.190 dated 02.08.2025 under Sections 318(4), 351(2) and 61(2) of BNS registered at Police Station Sadar Dhuri, District Sangrur.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners in these cases lured the complainant into purchasing a horse valued at Rs. 28 lakhs and accepted Rs. 9 lakhs as part payment. However, it later transpired that the horse was not worth more than Rs. 1 lakh.

4. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner in CRM-M-55398-2025 and CRM-M-59551-2025.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner appearing in CRM-M-2451-2026 submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that there is an unexplained delay of two months in the registration of the FIR. It is argued that the entire dispute arises out of a transaction relating to the purchase of a horse, which is fundamentally a civil matter concerning the price and delivery of goods.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioners have cheated the complainant in the guise of buying and selling horses. It is further submitted that the petitioner is not entitled to the grant of anticipatory bail as the cheated amount is yet to be recovered.

7. I have heard the submissions made by ld. counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. Considering the nature of the allegations, the gravity of the offence, the fact that the cheated amount is yet to be recovered, and that custodial



CRM-M-55398-2025 and other cases

interrogation of the petitioners is required for a thorough investigation, this Court is of the view that no exceptional or extra ordinary circumstances are made out to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Consequently, the present petitions are hereby dismissed.

25.03.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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