



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

207

CRM-M-61057-2025

UMED AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Date of decision: 16.02.2026

Date of uploading: 17.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Garima Dikshit, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No. 202 dated 25.09.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 409, 420 and 120-B of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Bhattu Kalan, District Fatehabad.

2. On 31.10.2025, the following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.202, dated 25.09.2025, registered at Police Station Bhattu Kalan, District Fatehabad (Annexure P-1), under Sections 406, 409, 420 and 120-B of IPC, 1860.

2. Notice of motion.



3. Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned counsel for the parties have been heard and material on file has been perused.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that one Surendra, who owned 9 Kanals and 8 Marlas of land, had agreed to sell the same to the complainant, Mohan Lal, vide agreement dated 13.01.2022, and the petitioners were attesting witnesses to the said agreement. With the mutual consent of the complainant and the said Surendra, the date for execution of the sale deed was extended from time to time. However, later on, Surendra, the owner of the land, did not sell the land to the complainant and, in fact, executed the sale deed in favour of some other person. Learned counsel further contended that the petitioners had no role to play in the omission of the offence, as they were merely attesting witnesses. They are ready to join the investigation. Nothing is to be recovered from their possession, and they may be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail in their favour.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the grant of bail and argued that the complainant had paid a sum of Rs. 10 lakh to the owner of the land, namely Surendra, which is yet to be recovered. Both the petitioners had connived with Surendra at the time of execution of the agreement. Infact, Surendra had already sold 5 Kanals and 2 Marlas of land prior to the execution of the agreement with the complainant, and the petitioners were attesting witnesses to that sale deed dated 22.05.2018 as well. They were, therefore, aware that Surendra did not own the entire land measuring 9 Kanals and 8 Marlas. It is further alleged that they had colluded with the owner, Surendra, in cheating the complainant, and in view of the gravity of the offence, the petitioners do not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Adjourned to 17.12.2025 for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation and in the event of their arrest, they shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
- ii) that the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- iii) that the petitioners shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;
- iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”



3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 31.10.2025, the petitioners have joined investigation and are no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has filed reply by way of affidavit in Court today. The same be kept on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to learned counsel for the petitioner. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are direct/serious in nature and hence he ought not to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail. He has further iterated that in case the petitioners are extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that he may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the investigation/witnesses.

5. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand; especially the factum of the petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated therein and are no longer required by the State for further custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 31.10.2025 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

8. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioners violate any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
9. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

16.02.2026
jatin

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