



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

CRM-M-68887-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 30.03.2026

Monika

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Divyam Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Ishnoor Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0214 dated 17.03.2025, under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) and Section 3(5) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station City Panipat, District Panipat.
2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the accused persons got fake sale deed No.6753 dated 09.08.2024 by presenting other girls in place of the complainant in the Registrar Office Panipat and when the complainant, namely, Mona, applied for NOC to sell the land, her NOC came after being cleared and when complainant Shalu applied for NOC, it was found that her land has been sold. After that, when they inquired from Tehsil Office, Panipat, they came to know that fake sale deed of both Mona and Shalu has been prepared by producing other girls in their place in favor of accused Rakesh Kumar. Thereafter, her uncle Ramphal and complainant herself inquired about the same then her uncle Ramphal told that Mukesh Singla and his brothers has got false agreement executed of the said land in which, uncle Ramphal and Jitendra Khatri in connivance with Sahdev made deal of crores



of rupees with Anil Chillar. After the deal, Mukesh Singla had taken a stay from the Court on the land of Poonam and had also taken it back. Thereafter, through Sahdev, pressure was exerted on Anil Chillar however, instead of getting it done in writing, Anil Chillar and Bholu Pehalwan, Sahdev, Mukesh Singla, Siddharth Singla and Rakesh after hatching the conspiracy. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and was arrested on 26.08.2025. She approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panipat praying for grant of bail, however, after hearing counsel for the parties and finding no merits, the same was declined vide order dated 01.12.2025. Hence, being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are regarding impersonation being done by her to get the forged deed executed. He has submitted that the sale deed has already been cancelled and petitioner is not even the beneficiary. He has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and she is behind the bars from last more than 07 months. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that it is duly established during investigation that the petitioner along with co-accused has illegally sold the land of the complainant. He has submitted that it is the petitioner who impersonated Mona. He has contended that petitioner had played an active role along with co-accused in committing the offence. He,



on instructions, has submitted that out of 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner in the present case was arrested on 26.08.2025 on the allegation of impersonation. As submitted before this Court, the sale deed which has been registered by the petitioner alongwith co-accused has already been cancelled. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that the petitioner has undergone the incarceration of 07 months and 03 days as on 28.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case. As submitted, out of 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after 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 her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

30.03.2026
m.sharma

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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