



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

133

**CRM-M-71533-2025
Date of decision: 12.03.2026**

MOHAMMAD SALMAN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Praveen Bhadhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 363 dated 20.11.2024, registered under Section(s) 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sector-56, Gurugram.

2. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the complainant purchased a plot measuring 907 Sq. Yards situated in Village Vajirabad from one Randeep Raj through his General Power of Attorney holder Rahul Paswan. An agreement to sell was entered on 10.04.2023 and the sale deed was executed through the General Power of Attorney on 03.01.2024. After

few days, the complainant came to know that Randeep Raj i.e. the owner

had cancelled the General Power of Attorney executed in favour of Rahul Paswan on 08.09.2023 and had executed a sale deed in favour of the petitioner on 23.10.2023 i.e. before execution of the sale deed by the GPA holder Rahul Paswan, in favour of the complainant. It was thus alleged that a fraud had been played upon him. On the above allegations, the present FIR came to be registered.

3. Learned Counsel contends that the petitioner is a *bona fide* purchaser of the aforesaid property and that the sale deed dated 23.10.2023 was registered in his favour by the owner Randeep Raj himself. In so far as the sale deed executed in favour of the complainant is concerned, the same was executed by the GPA holder Rahul Paswan at a later point in time i.e. after the cancellation of the General Power of Attorney by owner Randeep Raj on 08.09.2023. Hence, mere execution of an agreement to sell by the General Power of Attorney holder at an earlier point in time, would not render the petitioner liable for commission of the aforesaid offence. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 29.03.2025 and the offence(s) in question are triable by the Court of Magistrate. Further, there are 19 witnesses but none has been examined so far.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid facts as mentioned above.

5. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the period of custody undergone by the petitioner in a Magisterial trial, the nature of allegations levelled against him and that arguable issues with respect to his involvement would arise for determination during the trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.
7. 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.
8. 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.

MARCH 12, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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