

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

2026:PHHC:047207



(120)

CRM-M-62923-2025

Date of Decision: 25.03.2026

Chaman Saini

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ.

Present:- Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate with
Mr. Yatin Mehta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ.J (Oral)

1. The present second petition has been filed praying for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.455 dated 09.09.2023, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Sohna, Gurugram.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Santosh wife of Kulbir Singh. It was alleged that Devendra executed the sale deed Wasika No.2065 dated 10.08.2016 for the land measuring 06 Kanals 18 Marlas in her favour. It was alleged that on 26.05.2016, she gave the seller Devendra Rs.5 lacs in cash, Rs.8 lacs through cheque dated 02.06.2016 and Rs.7 lacs through cheque dated 01.08.2016 and both the cheques were drawn on State Bank of India, Rohtak Branch. Thereafter, she sold the land to Birma wife of Rajendra on 18.03.2018 for a consideration of Rs.20 lacs, however, after some time, she came to know that Devendra from whom she purchased the land was an

impostor. She had given all the money to a person, who was posing to be Devendra, and Chaman (petitioner) who used to come together. It was alleged that the sale deed on the basis of which she had purchased the land was executed by a Devendra and his accomplice. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 26.06.2024. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 06.10.2025. Aggrieved, petitioner approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-55926-2024 which was also dismissed vide order dated 28.04.2025 and the same was assailed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing SLP (Crl.) No.8822/2025 and was dismissed vide order dated 11.06.2025. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He contends that the petitioner is not the beneficiary. The allegations against the petitioner are that he identified the co-accused S.P. Singh as Devender Singh. Counsel contends that the petitioner is behind bars for the last more than 1 ½ years. To buttress his arguments, counsel submits that petitioner has no criminal antecedents and even the material witnesses including the complainant already stand examined by the learned Trial Court. He, thus, prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that petitioner had played an active role in the commission of offence as it was the petitioner who identified S.P. Singh as Devender Singh, who was the original owner of the property. Learned State counsel further submitted that it is also established during the investigation that the petitioner even opened the bank account in the name of Devender Singh. It is, thus, submitted that the complicity of the petitioner is duly established. State counsel, on instructions, submits that out of the total cited 15 prosecution witnesses 10 already stand examined by the learned Trial Court. As per the custody certificate produced by State, petitioner has undergone an actual custody period of 01 year, 08 months and 29 days as on 24.03.2026 and he is not involved in any other case.

5. Reply by way of affidavit of Jitender, HPS, A.C.P., Gurugram, on behalf of respondent-State has been filed in Court today. Same is taken on record and a copy has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been alleged to be the part of the conspiracy. The land was purchased by the complainant. Even otherwise, all the material witnesses including the complainant already stand examined by the learned Trial Court. As per the custody certificate produced by State, petitioner has undergone an actual custody period of 01 year, 08 months and 29 days as on 24.03.2026 and he is not involved in any other case.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the

case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25.03.2026
lucky

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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