



CRM-M-58669-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

184

CRM-M-58669-2025
Decided on : 25.03.2026

Ranjeet Kumar

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Rajinder Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, 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
Ranjeet Kumar, aged 39 years	598	07.12.2024	419, 467, 468, 120-B IPC (Section 474 IPC added later on)	Kherki Daula	Gurugram

2. As per allegations in FIR, the complainant moved a complaint to the effect that the complainant company is the owner in possession of land admeasuring 10.24375 acres, comprised in Rectangle No. 31, Killa Nos. 22/2, 23/2, 24/2, 25/2; Rectangle No. 44, Killa Nos. 2/2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7/1, 7/2, 8/1, 8/2,9/1,

**CRM-M-58669-2025**

14/1, 15/1/1; and Rectangle No. 45, Killa No. 1/1, 10/2, total admeasuring 81 Kanals 19 Marlas, a residential Plotted Colony under Deen Dayal Awas Yojana, situated in the revenue estate of Village Kherki Daula, Sector-76, Gurugram, by virtue of three separate Sale Deeds dated 09-09-2021. The complainant company is duly authorized to set up an affordable plotted colony at the said land. It has been further alleged that to the utter shock of the complainant company, an official of the complainant company came to know from one of their external vendor that one fabricated Term Sheet/MOU has been created with regard to the said land. Upon perusal of the said Term Sheet/MOU, the complainant company got to know that R3R Estate Private Limited has entered into a transaction for sale and purchase of the said land. It has been further alleged that some Punit Singh is shown to be the authorized signatory of the complainant company and he has signed the said Term Sheet for and on behalf of the complainant company. It has been further stated that the complainant company has never executed any such Term Sheet with any party at any point of time regarding the sale of the said land and has not received any consideration regarding the said land. It has been further alleged that the accused persons have conspired together and prepared a false and fabricated document with the intention to cause wrongful loss to the complainant company and wrongful gain to themselves. That the complainant company got public notices published in daily newspapers regarding the same and notified that no such Term Sheet/MOU has been executed by the complainant company. Further, it has been prayed to initiate necessary legal action against the accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that basically the document, which has been questioned is one Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and as a consequence of which, one agreement was to be executed later on. He further



CRM-M-58669-2025

submits that said MOU was never executed nor any financial transaction took place. Therefore, there being no financial loss to any one and rather the allegations are to be proved through documentary evidence, counsel for the petitioner submits that he be granted bail because even charges are yet to be framed and thereupon the process of recording of statements of witnesses is yet to start.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that petitioner has played fraud by preparing a fabricated term sheet/MOU, about the sale and purchase of the plots belonging to the complainant company. However, learned State counsel could not point any financial transaction took place, due to which petitioner availed undue monetary benefit.

5. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available before it.

6. Considering all the circumstances and the fact that after completion of investigation, challan was submitted on 31.07.2025 and charges are yet to be framed. The petition is lying inside jail since 06.05.2025 and all the offences being triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, the petitioner need not to be detained in custody for indefinite period, unless charges are proved beyond doubt.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to



CRM-M-58669-2025

decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 25, 2026

reena

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No