



CRM-M-68174-2025

1

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

105

**CRM-M-68174-2025  
Decided on :27.02.2026**

Suresh Gupta

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Himanshu Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. (now Section 482 of BNSS), seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 151 dated 17.09.2025, registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Haibowal, District Ludhiana.

2. The FIR was lodged by complainant Amarjit Singh against the following accused: i) Suresh Gupta (petitioner herein), ii) Raj Rani, iii) Vijay Kumar, and iv) Gurwinder Kaur w/o Jaswinder Singh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that effectively there are only three accused, as no case has been registered against the fourth accused, Gurwinder Kaur.

3. According to the allegations, petitioner-Suresh Gupta, a property dealer, entered into an agreement with the complainant for the sale of Flat No. 4 (Ground Floor) and Flat No. 12 (First Floor), each

**CRM-M-68174-2025****2**

measuring 90 square yards, situated at Village Jassia, Tehsil and District Ludhiana, for a total consideration of Rs. 15 lakhs, as reflected in the agreement to sell.

It is further alleged that an additional amount of Rs. 3 lakhs was subsequently credited to the petitioner's bank account on 01.06.2022 and 10.06.2022 through cheques issued by the complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that this is purely a civil dispute, and no civil suit has been filed by the complainant.

5. Status report indicates that the dispute was once resolved amicably; however, petitioner allegedly failed to make the payment as agreed. Considering that the flats in question were in the name of his mother, Raj Rani, that petitioner received the payment from the complainant, and subsequently reneged on his obligations, this Court is of the view that there is no sufficient justification for granting the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail. Therefore, present petition is hereby dismissed.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**27.02.2026*****Rashmi***

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