



106

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-63211-2025
DECIDED ON: 22.04.2026

ASHOK SINGH.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Abhishek Sethi, Advocate, and
Ms. Richa Sethi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Om Parkash, Advocate,
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 First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ashok Singh, aged about 69 years	306	22.09.2025	318(4), 336(3), 340, 351(2) of BNS (338 of BNS added later on)	Asauda	Jhajjar

2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 11.11.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx
2. On oral request made by counsel for the petitioner, complainant namely Ankit, son of Harbir



Singh, resident of Village Jakhauda, Tehsil Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar, is hereby ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2.

Let amended memo of parties be filed by counsel for the petitioner in the Registry, within a period of two days from today, without moving any separate application.

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that as per the case of complainant/prosecution, petitioner was the owner of a plot measuring 250 square yards, having valid title vide registered sale deed dated 20.05.2020 (Annexure P-3). The said plot was agreed to be sold to respondent No.2/complainant for a total sale consideration of Rs.58,12,500/-. Subsequently, by mutual oral agreement, the plot was divided between two purchasers — complainant Ankit, who was to purchase 135 square yards, and Sushma (a relative of Ankit), who was to purchase 115 square yards. For Ankit's portion, total sale price was Rs.38,00,000/-, while for Sushma's portion, the amount was Rs.19,55,000/-.*

Referring to the full payment agreement dated 28.07.2025 (Annexure P-5), counsel for the petitioner submits that though an amount of Rs.22,95,000/- had actually been received from Ankit, yet, relying on his assurance and in bona fide belief, it was mentioned in the agreement that "the whole amount of Rs.22,95,000/- has been received from the buyer and nothing remains to be paid." The said agreement also provided that if the registration of the sale deed was permitted by the Government and the petitioner refused to execute it, the buyer would be at liberty to get the sale deed registered through the Court.

3. *To clarify the factual position, counsel for the petitioner refers to another full payment agreement dated 28.07.2025 (Annexure P-6), executed between the petitioner (as seller) and Sushma (as purchaser) for the plot measuring 115 square yards at a total sale consideration of Rs.19,55,000/-, in which, said amount admittedly had been received in full. Hence, the only dispute that remains pertains to non-payment of Rs.9,62,500/- by complainant Ankit to the petitioner, due to which the original property documents have not been handed over to him.*

It is submitted that FIR was registered on a concocted version, falsely alleging that petitioner is not the actual owner of the land. Counsel for the petitioner argues that this allegation is baseless, since



the petitioner is lawful owner of the property as per the sale deed dated 20.05.2020 (Annexure P-3), which has never been cancelled or set aside by any authority or court. Even if the allegation regarding withholding of documents is accepted, dispute remains civil in nature, as the complainant's remedy lies in filing a civil suit. However, to exert pressure on the petitioner, complainant has maliciously initiated criminal proceedings.

4. *It is further submitted that dispute essentially revolves around non-payment of the balance sale consideration of Rs.9,62,500/-, and the entire case rests on documentary evidence. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose. Moreover, petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and fully cooperate with the authorities, provided he is protected from arrest. Thus, counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner in the present case.*

5. *Notice of motion.*

6. *On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.*

7. *Adjourned to 29.01.2026.*

8. *Let newly added respondent No.2/complainant be informed about the next date of hearing fixed before this Court, through the SHO concerned.*

9. *Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of his arrest, the petitioner shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).*

10. *Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.*

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.”

3. Today, learned State counsel has filed copy of supplementary status report dated 10.04.2026 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.

4. Referring to the supplementary status report dated 10.04.2026, learned State counsel submits that four additional criminal cases are registered against the petitioner, pertaining to the allegations of cheating and fraud. For reference, details of all the FIRs are reproduced here below:-

“(i) FIR No. 222/2022, U/s 420, 467, 468, 471, 34 of IPC, Police Station Prem Nagar, Delhi wherein the petitioner is on bail and the same is fixed for 27.04.2026 for prosecution evidence.

(ii) FIR No. 453/2021 U/s 452, 323, 34 of IPC, Police Station Dwarka, North Delhi wherein the petitioner is on bail and the same is fixed for 12.05.2026 for framing of charge.

(iii) FIR No. 311/10 U/s 420, 468, 471, 34 of the IPC, Police Station Vijay Vihar, Delhi wherein the petitioner is on bail and the same is fixed for 06.05.2026 for framing of charge.

(iv) FIR No. 279/10 Section 420 of IPC, Police Station Aman Vihar, Delhi wherein the petitioner has been compounded/acquitted vide order dated 12.01.2013.”

5. In response to this, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in order to ascertain the petitioner’s involvement in any other criminal cases, sincere efforts were made; however, petitioner failed to come forward to clarify the position or disclose the true facts.

It is further submitted that, while drafting paragraph No.25 of the present petition—wherein it is mentioned that petitioner is not involved in any other case—petitioner was specifically queried on this aspect, to which he responded in the negative.



CRM-M-63211-2025

5

Thus, learned counsel submits that, being an officer of the Court, he is left with no other option, except to accept the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is, in fact, involved in four other criminal cases of a similar nature.

6. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

7. Considering the fact that petitioner has concealed a material fact regarding his involvement in other criminal cases of a similar nature, particularly in paragraph No.25 of the present petition, and in view of his unfair conduct, this Court finds no justifiable ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.

8. Investigating Officer is directed to proceed forthwith in accordance with law.

9. Let a copy of this order be forwarded to the concerned Superintendent of Police for necessary action.

22.04.2026*Lavisha***(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned* *Yes/No**Whether reportable* *Yes/No*