

2026:PHHC:030447



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

116 (1 & 3 CASE)

Date of decision: 25.02.2026

CRM-M-72499-2025

AADIL KHAN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CRM-M-1807-2026

AMREEP SINGH @ MANI DALAL

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Sanawar Ali, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-72499-2025.

Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-1807-2026.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Both these petitions arising out of the same FIR are being
decided by a common order.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) *inter*

alia contend that deceased Sultan Garg, a former employee of Markfed had started a rice mill. He, however, suffered losses, whereafter he entered the trade of thoroughbred horses and cows. They contend that the deceased Sultan Garg expressed his intention to purchase two bred Horses and two thoroughbred Cows to Amreep Singh @ Mani Dalal (Petitioner in CRM-M-1807-2026). The above Amreep Singh @ Mani Dalal introduced him to Harpreet Singh (since then arrested), who then sold two horses and two cows to the deceased Sultan Garg at a price of Rs. 60 lakhs. It is contended that after the aforesaid transaction had been completed, deceased Sultan Garg wanted to further sell the horses. He thus came in contact with Aadil Khan (Petitioner in CRM-M-72499-2025). The said Aadil Khan alongwith one Mewa Singh introduced Sultan Garg (since deceased) to one Gurpreet Singh. The deceased-Sultan Garg sold his both horses to Gurpreet Singh and in exchange purchased one horse from Gurpreet Singh. It is contended that later it transpired that the horse sold by Gurpreet Singh to deceased Sultan Garg, in exchange for the two horses, was not of the breed as claimed. He accordingly contacted Aadil Khan and Mewa Singh again and got in touch with Gurpreet Singh. The said Gurpreet Singh on persuasion, returned one of the two horses that had been sold by deceased Sultan Garg to the former alongwith the horse that had been traded by him to deceased Sultan Garg.

3. Counsel contend that so far as the allegation of supply of two horses and two cows is concerned, there is not an iota of allegation in the video allegedly prepared by the deceased Sultan Garg soon before his death, to substantiate that the cows as well as the horses were not of the breed as promised. They further contend that moreover, the trigger event was not on account of the sale of the cows and horses by Harpreet Singh to Sultan Garg

but was the subsequent transaction with Gurpreet Singh, who handed over an underbred horse, in exchange of the two bred horses, by Harpreet Singh to deceased Sultan Garg. They contend that in the absence of any documentation with respect to the proof of the breed assured and that the assured breed was not delivered, there can be no attribution of abetment/instigations by the petitioner(s) herein. The grievance, if any, would thus be primarily against Gurpreet Singh who is already in custody and his regular bail has also been dismissed.

4. Counsel for the petitioner-Aadil Khan contends that he alongwith Mewa Singh only introduced Sultan Garg to Gurpreet Singh and that deceased Sultan Garg had carried out his own due diligence before purchasing the horse from Gurpreet Singh. They further mediated return of one horse to Sultan Garg as well. Hence, bail be granted to them.

5. Counsel for the respondent-State, however, contends that the petitioners are involved in similar cases of committing cheating and that two FIRs have been registered against Aadil Khan while four other FIRs have been registered against petitioner-Amreep Singh @ Mani Dalal. The details of the said FIRs are extracted as under :-

Accused Name	FIR & Date	Section	Police Station
Aadil	FIR No. 76 of 2022	420/34/506/34 of the IPC, 1860	Police Station City Sunam
	FIR No. 131/2018	18/61/85 of the NDPS Act, 1985	Police Station City Dhuri.
Amreep Singh @ Mani Dalal	FIR No. 05 dated 03.01.2023	420, 120-B of the IPC	Police Station City, Barnala
	FIR No. 77 dated 22.07.2023	420, 120-B of the IPC	Police Station Tapa
	FIR No.139 dated 13.10.2023	323, 341, 34, 506 of the IPC	Police Station Tapa
	FIR No. 68 dated 20.07.2024	109(1), 115(2), 125, 351(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 and	Police Station Tapa

		Sections 25, 27/54/59 of the Arms Act	
--	--	---	--

6. Learned State Counsel further contends that deceased Sultan Garg had specifically named the petitioner(s) herein as the persons who cheated him on the pretext of giving thoroughbred horses, that were not found to be of the same bred quality. It is submitted that the theory being set up by the petitioner(s) cannot be accepted at this juncture since had the grievance of the deceased been only with respect to the horse supplied by Gurpreet Singh, there would have been no occasion as to why he would also nominate petitioner herein in his suicide note/video. The fact that he had specifically named the petitioner(s) and taking into consideration their criminal antecedents and involvement in similar offence(s) shows that the petitioner(s) were acting in collusion with the other accused and allured the deceased to purchase un-bred horses at high prices and escalate financial meltdown of the deceased.

7. Learned State Counsel as well as Counsel for the complainant further contend that as per the suicide video, an amount of more than Rs. 1.10 crores was handed over to the petitioner(s) herein for purchase of the horses, however, Counsel for the petitioner(s) however contend that the deal for supply of two horses and Cows was for a sum of Rs. 50 lakhs only. No explanation has been offered for the rest of the amount of Rs. 60 lakhs and how the differential amount has been appropriated. It is seemingly apparent that the petitioner(s) have claimed a sum of Rs. 1.10 crores for two horses and two cows they accounted only for an amount of Rs. 50 lakhs. The difference in the quality of the horses and cows being supplied is thus evident from the aforesaid circumstance itself.

8. They further contend that notwithstanding the involvement of the petitioner(s) in the other FIRs as aforesaid, they did not make this disclosure in the anticipatory bail petitions filed before this Court, which is supported by an affidavit, despite the High Court Rules & Orders mandating a litigant to make a declaration with respect to his involvement in any other criminal cases. The said concealment reflects vitally on the intent and the motives of the petitioner(s).

9. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners.

10. It remains undisputed that deceased Sultan Garg had got recorded a video soon before he committed suicide naming the petitioner(s) and levelling allegations against them for having cheated the deceased on the pretext of business in thorough breeds. The deal was fraudulent and drove him to financial drain and he committed suicide due to economic duress and social back-lash. The petitioner(s) were undisputedly catalysts in brokering the deal and handling the money. It would thus be pre-mature at this juncture to hold the petitioner(s) innocent or to even rule that creation of such financial vortex trap by the petitioners cannot be construed as abetment/instigation or aiding suicide. The regular financial blow caused by the petitioners and its impact are yet to be legally examined.

11. Taking into consideration the nature of the specific allegations against the petitioner(s), and the mode and manner in which they are alleged to have acted and duped the deceased by alluring him into a profiteering breeding business and supplying a breed different from what was assured, and by overpricing the same, it is seem that they eventually goaded the deceased, who had entered into the said venture to overcome his financial

troubles, into financial loss and rough waters, which clearly led to the commission of suicide.

12. The involvement of petitioners in other such cases further makes out a case against them. The involvement is thus not incidental but seems deliberate and conscious and is executed through a network of agents and impersonators. The same would require a thorough probe. The petitioners have not been able to make out a case for grant of anticipatory bail.

Finding no grounds, the present petitions are dismissed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 25, 2026
Vishal Sharma

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