

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:007816



241

CRM-M-68214-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:20.01.2026

Girish Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vipul Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Srikant, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Gurinder Singh Dhillon, Advocate for the complainant.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 138 dated 07.06.2024 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Chhainsa, District Faridabad.

2. Adumbrated facts as emanating from the record are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of complaint lodged by complainant Karvendra Singh @ Karmendra Singh alleging therein that his mother Narayani @ Girrajo Devi wife of late Nawab Singh was co-owner in possession of 10 kanals and 08 marlas of agricultural land situated within the

Revenue Estate of Chhainsa, Faridabad. Mutation of this land was entered in the name of his mother on 04.01.1966. She had died on 20.11.1970. After her death, the complainant along with other legal representatives of his mother had inherited ownership of this land. They had requested their maternal uncle Nihal and his son Rajendra to get the mutation of inheritance transferred and entered in their name and both of them had assured to do so.

3. The complainant further alleged that on asking of Nihal Singh and Rajender, the land in question had been given to them for cultivation on an oral lease in lieu of receipt of a small amount of money as lease money. After the death of Nihal Singh, the accused Rajender, present petitioner and Digamber, who are sons of the deceased, had been cultivating the said land and used to pay lease money. However, from the last two years, they had stopped doing so. The complainant further alleged that he along with his brother Raghuraj Singh had decided to sell some area of land inherited from their mother and had accordingly entered into an agreement to sell the same with one Satyapal. They had also received a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- by way of earnest money. He alleged that before entering into an agreement, he had contacted the village Patwari for procuring jamabandi and then came to know that the land in question was still in the name of his deceased mother. When he asked the accused-Rajender to get the mutation entered in the names of legal representatives of his mother, he came to know that the mutation of inheritance of the same land had been entered in the names of petitioner, Omi Singh, Pappu, Dharam Pal, Bhimvati, Lakhpal and Ashok as on 27.12.2023. They also disclosed that the above named accused had again executed a relinquishment deed qua the same land in favour of the accused

Rajender Singh, present petitioner and Digambar. It also came to the knowledge of the complainant that the accused Omi Singh etc. had represented themselves to be legal representatives of Smt. Narayani. The documents including the death certificate as submitted by the accused were found to be forged and fabricated. By alleging that they had been cheated by the accused persons and in connivance with accused Rajender Singh, offences of forgery and use of forged documents had been committed, he prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested and is in custody since 05.11.2025.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 05.11.2025. Similarly situated co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. The subject offences are triable by the Magistrate. He is not required for further investigation. Infact the dispute between the parties is of civil nature. He has clean antecedents. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Fresh power of attorney on behalf of the complainant has also been filed. Though, written request has been circulated on behalf of Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate, mentioning that he is counsel for the complainant but learned counsel for the complainant, who has filed fresh power of attorney today, is ready to argue the matter and has submitted that he has no objection if the petition is allowed and a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and even a petition seeking quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise, is pending before this Court.

6. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. The investigation qua him is still pending and supplementary challan has not been filed. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have cheated the complainant in order to deprive him of his rights in the property inherited from his mother and is further alleged to have committed offences of forgery and use of forged documents by forging certain documents qua the mother of the complainant and submitting the same before the revenue authorities. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. He is in custody since 05.11.2025. The investigation and trial are likely to take time. Learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 has raised no serious objection as to allowing of the petition and has also submitted that infact a compromise has been arrived at between the parties. Though challan qua the petitioner has not been filed but he is not required for further investigation. Given the nature of the allegations as levelled against him, this Court is of the considered opinion that no fruitful purpose is going to be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any more. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.01.2026

harjeet

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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