



CRM-M-58233-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-58233-2025
Decided on: 21.01.2026

Rajesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sunny Tyagi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG Haryana

Mr. Rajesh Goyal, Advcaote
for respondent No. 2

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 FIR No.309 dated 10.06.2025, under Sections 406 and 420 IPC at PS Old Industrial, District Panipat.

2. On hearing the petitioner's counsel, on 10.11.2025, the following order was passed:

“CRM-44745-2025

1. Present application has been moved by the applicant/petitioner for placing on record copies of agreements with Nitu Rani dated 04.09.2014 and agreement with Jaibir Sharama, as Annexure P-3 and P-4, respectively.

2. Considering the averments mentioned in the application, prayer made in the application is allowed and copies of agreements with Nitu Rani dated 04.09.2014 and agreement with Jaibir Sharama, are ordered to be taken on record, as Annexure P-3 and P-4, respectively. Registry is directed to tag the same at the



appropriate place on the file.

3. CM stands disposed of.

CRM-M-58233-2025

(i) 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:

<i>Name of Petitioner(s)</i>	<i>FIR No.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Section(s)</i>	<i>Police Station</i>	<i>District</i>
<i>Rajesh Kumar, aged about 41 years</i>	<i>309</i>	<i>10.06.2025</i>	<i>406 and 420 IPC</i>	<i>Old Industrial</i>	<i>Panipat</i>

(ii) On oral request made by counsel for the complainant, complainant namely Neetu Rani, daughter of Shri Chintram, resident of 19/315 Daya Basti, Old Rohtak Road, Delhi – 110035, is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2 in the present petition.

Let amended memo of parties be filed by learned counsel for respondent No.2, in the Registry, within a period of two days from today, without moving any separate application.

(iii) Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that complainant, Neetu Rani, has got registered the present FIR alleging that she had purchased Plot No.34, measuring 105 square yards, situated in Sai Colony, near Jatal Road, Panipat, from the petitioner–accused Rajesh Kumar Rana for a total sale consideration of Rs.5,46,000/- in the year 2018. At the time of purchase, complainant had inspected the plot, but thereafter she did not take care of the property. It is alleged in the FIR that when the complainant recently visited the site, she found that one Jaiveer Sharma had constructed a house on the said land. Upon inquiry, the person in possession informed her that he had, in fact, purchased the land from the same accused, Rajesh Kumar Rana, in the year 2017 for a consideration of Rs.5,96,700/-. Realizing this, complainant felt that she had been cheated by the petitioner, leading to the registration of the impugned FIR.

(iv) Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in reality, after the alleged purchase of the plot, complainant failed to protect her possession and, without getting any sale deed executed or registered in her favour in pursuance to the agreement to sell, has directly lodged the FIR while claiming ownership over the property. It is further submitted that, as per the terms of the agreement, possession of the plot had been handed over to the complainant on the spot.

Counsel also refers to the “Full and Final Payment Agreement” executed



CRM-M-58233-2025

between the petitioner and complainant Neetu Rani, and points out that the said document pertains to Plot No.34, whereas, in the full and final payment agreement (Annexure P-4), the plot subject to sale was Plot No. 33, measuring 110.5 square yards, which had been sold to one Jaiveer Sharma. By referring to both agreements (Annexures P-3 and P-4), learned counsel argues that plot numbers, their sizes, and properties sold to the complainant and to Jaiveer Sharma are entirely distinct.

It is thus contended that no element of criminality is made out from the allegations and dispute, if any, is purely of a civil nature. It is further submitted that FIR has been registered only with an intent to exert undue pressure upon the petitioner. However, petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon, provided he is granted protection from arrest. Thus, counsel prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

(iv) Notice of motion.

(v) On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Rajesh Goyal, Advocate, puts an appearance on behalf of the complainant.

(vi) Adjourned to 21.11.2025.

To be shown in the urgent list.

(vii) Meanwhile, petitioner shall not be arrested. However, issue of joining of investigation by the petitioner would be examined on the next date of hearing, after reviewing the status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel.

(viii) Let the petitioner remain present on the next date of hearing before this Court, to clear the position as to when the correction in the plot number was introduced in the second agreement executed by him in favour of Jaiveer Sharma.

(ix) It will also be open for respondent No.2, if she wishes, to be present before this Court on the next date of hearing.”

3. Again on 21.11.2025, by impleading one more person namely Jaiveer Sharma as respondent No. 3, the following order was passed:

(i) Learned State counsel has filed status report dated 20.11.2025 in the Court today and the same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

(ii) 2. In compliance with the direction issued by this Court, vide order dated 10.11.2025, petitioner, Rajesh Kumar, is present and submits that he had a big chunk of land, from which plots were sold to the complainant, Neetu Rani, as



CRM-M-58233-2025

4

well as to one Jaiveer Sharma. He further submits that he is willing to resolve the dispute amicably by appearing before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court along with the concerned parties.

(iii) Let Jaiveer Sharma be impleaded as respondent No.3 in the present petition. Amended memo of parties in this regard, by giving his full particulars, be filed by counsel for the petitioner in the Registry, within a period of next two working days, without moving any separate application.

(iv) Thereafter, Registry is directed to issue notice to newly impleaded respondent No.3, Jaiveer Sharma, through the SHO concerned.

(v) In view of the statement made by the petitioner, parties, i.e. petitioner namely Rajesh Kumar and respondent Nos.2 and 3, namely Neetu Rani and Jaiveer Sharma, are directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 05.12.2025.

(vi) List again on 16.12.2025, awaiting report.

To be shown in the urgent list.

(vii) It is further directed that petitioner shall pay an amount of Rs.2,500/- to each of the private respondent Nos.2 and 3 towards their to and-fro expenses.

(viii) Interim order to continue, till the next date of hearing.”

4. In pursuance to the recommending of the dispute to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, the same has been settled by resolving it in amicable manner with the help of learned Mediator. As per terms of the settlement recorded before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre, an amount of Rs. 08 lacs has already been received by the complainant-Nitu Rani from the petitioner and balance amount of Rs. 02 lacs has to be received by her, in the 1st week of March, 2026.

5. Thus, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for allowing of the petition by making the interim order dated 10.11.2025, absolute.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel points out that infact the arrest was stayed, therefore, the petitioner was unable to join investigation, however, learned counsel for the complainant submits that the complainant has



CRM-M-58233-2025

already received an amount of Rs. 08 lacs and has no objection if the petition is allowed as prayed for.

7. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and order dated 10.11.2025 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute.

8. It is expected that the parties to the agreement would abide by the terms and conditions mentioned in the settlement agreement dated 11.12.2025, before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court.

9. The petitioner shall abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

21.01.2026
reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:	YES/ NO
Whether Reportable:	YES /NO