



CRM-M-59513-2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

128

CRM-M-59513-2025
Decided on : 05.03.2026

RANJIT SINGH ALIAS RANJEET SINGH
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rajinder Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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
Ranjit Singh alias Ranjeet Singh, aged about 39 years	235	29.08.2024	409, 120-B, 420 of IPC	Furrukh Nagar	Gurugram

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the present case, the alleged victims, namely Harphool Singh, Rajkumar, Khem Chand Kirar, Pawan Kumar Kayat, Sumedha, Poonam, Kusum,



Saity Prakash, Satyawati, and Prem Sagar, are stated to have been defrauded for a total amount of Rs. 2,01,34,800/-.

As per the allegations, petitioner-Ranjit Singh @ Ranjeet Singh, who is the proprietor of M/s Manran Enterprises (India) Pvt. Ltd. and a property dealer, along with his driver and staff members, namely Omparkash, Kuldeep, and Ram Niwas Yadav, allegedly collected money from the victims for the sale of plots situated in a portion of land at Village Patli Hajipur, Tehsil Farrukhnagar, District Gurugram. After receiving the amounts, petitioner did not respond to the calls made by the victims.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that dispute is entirely of civil nature. Petitioner is in custody since 17.03.2025.

Further submits that although, after investigation, *challan* was submitted on 15.05.2025, and charges were framed on 21.07.2025, but the trial is still pending and prosecution evidence has not yet been recorded. Thus, completion of trial is likely to take a considerable time.

4. It is further submitted that sale deed for the land in question could not be executed in favour of the petitioner and, for that reason, the promised plots could not be allotted to the victims. Moreover, dispute has arisen out of an agreement to sell, which can only be adjudicated by a Civil Court.

Learned counsel submits that any further incarceration of the petitioner in the present case, which is triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, would serve no meaningful purpose and keeping the petitioner behind bars indefinitely, would be unjust. Thus, counsel prays



that petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail in the present case.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that petitioner has allegedly defrauded a large number of victims, causing a total loss of Rs. 2,01,34,800/-.

It is further submitted that petitioner is also found to be involved in another case, i.e., FIR No. 598 dated 07.12.2024, registered under Sections 419, 467, 468, and 120-B of the IPC at Police Station Kherki Daula, District Gurugram.

6. Learned State counsel contends that in view of the seriousness of the alleged offences, petitioner is not entitled to seek the concession of regular bail, as there exists a possibility that he may tamper with evidence, influence material witnesses, or abscond, thereby delaying the trial. Therefore, it is submitted that present petition deserves to be dismissed.

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

8. Considering the totality of the circumstances, nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, factors noticed here above, coupled with the facts that all the offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, total period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner, and stage of the trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.



CRM-M-59513-2025

4

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.

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

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

05.03.2026

Lavisha

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