

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

2026.PHHC.011155



CRM-M-69478-2025 (O&M).
Date of decision: 27.01.2026.

DEEPANSHU KHATRI @ ARJUN

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Rishav Jain, Advocate, with
Mr. Ankit Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Aditi Girdhar, AAG, Haryana, assisted by P/S.I. Anshul.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case bearing FIR No.49 dated 12.04.2025, under Section(s) 316(2), 318(4),
3(5) and 338 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police
Station BPTP, District Faridabad.

The prosecution case as mentioned in the order of the trial court reads as under: -

This FIR is registered on the written application filed by the complainant Amit Kumar Srivastava with the allegations that in June, 2024, he was looking for a flat in Faridabad and thus came in contact with accused Vipul Plaza (property dealer), Arjun @ Dipanshu (applicant), Rajiv Mittal and Shubham Raghav at their office of property dealer and after discussion, he agreed to purchase one flat no. P-1B, 9th floor at Anushri Apartment in total sum of ₹ 46,50,000/- and out of the said amount, he paid 7,33,000/- by cheque to accused Arjun @ Dipanshu Khatri and thereafter, further amount paid through cheque and online mode and in this manner, he paid total amount of 20,23,748/- and after receiving the said amount, accused Arjun @ Dipanshu handed over him builder buyer agreement in September, 2024 along with receipts of payments, allotment letter etc. and when he applied for a loan in the bank on the basis of aforesaid documents then he came to know that these documents are fake and his loan was rejected and when he asked the accused persons to return their money then accused Arjun handed over five cheques but they were got dishonoured and thereafter, when complainant demanded their money then accused Arjun and his partners abused and threatened for dire consequences if he asked to return his money.”

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a property dealer and is in custody since 30.07.2025. He has undergone an actual custody for a period of 5½ months. Learned counsel further submits that the case is triable by a Magistrate and that the investigation stands completed. He contends that since the charge is yet to be

framed, hence, the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time.

State counsel, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner has duped the complainant for a sum of Rs.20.23 lakhs approximately on the pretext of obtaining a flat for the complainant but the needful was not done. It is contended that the petitioner, in connivance with his brother, prepared forged and fabricated documents and, on the strength thereof, received the said amount from the complainant. It is submitted that the petitioner has criminal antecedents and he is involved in three other cases as well. She, however, does not dispute that the petitioner has been in custody for the last more than 5½ months and the investigation in the case is already complete. It is also not in dispute that the charge in the present case has not yet been framed.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody undergone by petitioner, which is more than 5½ month as well as the stage of the trial which is yet to commence as the charges are yet to be framed coupled with the fact that the it being a Magistrate trial will take a long time to conclude, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an

expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

January 27, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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