



CRM-M-73087-2025

1

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

120

**CRM-M-73087-2025
Decided on: 23.02.2026**

Om Parkash Bhati**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and another****.....Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Kartar Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Neeru Bansal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 102 dated 31.08.2024, under Sections 420, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Bhiwani, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. Ms. Neeru Bansal, Advocate, appeared on behalf of complainant-respondent No. 2. Pursuant to the order dated 17.02.2026 passed by this Court, an amount of Rs. 25,000/- has been handed over by the petitioner's counsel to the counsel representing respondent No. 2 in Court today.

3. The admitted position is that, without having any actual ownership, petitioner received an amount of Rs. 8,38,100/- from the complainant.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner on 19.01.2026, the following was recorded

“1. Petitioner – Om Parkash Bhati, aged 43 years, has filed instant petition for seeking anticipatory/regular bail in case FIR No. 102 dated 31.08.2024, registered under



Sections 420, 120-B IPC at Police Station Bhiwani, District Faridabad, Haryana.

2. *Complainant – Satyender Singh Rawat, has got registered the FIR in question, alleged therein that a plot was purchased by him in the name of his wife, from the petitioner/accused – Om Parkash Bhati, who is Director of M/s New JMD Land Icon Pvt. Ltd., for a total sale consideration of Rs.9,60,000/-. Already an amount of Rs.8,38,100/- has been paid to the accused. Neither any plot was got registered in the name of the complainant's wife, nor the amount was given back to him. During inquiry, it was found that agreement to sell was executed by the petitioner in favour of the complainant's wife on 20.01.2014, but in actual, complainant's wife became owner on 01.09.2014 vide registered sale deed, bearing Vasika No.2648, dated 01.09.2014. Even thereafter also, petitioner failed to execute sale-deed in favour of complainant's wife.*

3. *Counsel for the petitioner argues that allegations are false and frivolous and even as per the complaint no criminal offence is made out. Dispute, if any, could have been raised by the complainant by filing a civil suit that too within the limitation period. Thus, FIR is itself a concocted version, after much belated time, even without disclosing in the FIR as and when the agreement to sell was executed and how the amount was paid.*

4. *On the other hand, learned State counsel refers to status report dated 10.01.2026 and submits that as per investigation, petitioner though had received an amount of Rs.8,38,100/- from the complainant, but never executed the sale-deed. Along with status report, copy of the agreement to sell dated 20.01.2014 is also appended. Learned State counsel also refers paragraph No.12 of the status report,*



CRM-M-73087-2025

3

wherein, it has been detailed in tabulated form that petitioner is involved in 17 other criminal cases, and out of which, 08 cases are under Section 174-A of IPC, apart the cases of cheating and violation of provisions of HUDA Act.

5. *List again on 17.02.2026.*

6. *Let respondent No. 2 be served for the next date of hearing through dasti process as well."*

4. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 refers to paragraph 8 of the petition and submits that it is an almost admitted position that on 02.04.2014, petitioner had entered into an agreement to sell, being the purchaser of agricultural land from Jaswant Singh, Bharat Lal Jendea @ Bharat Singh, Rajender Singh, Ram Avtar, and Vijay Kumar, whereas he became the owner on 01.09.2014, and in the intervening period on 20.01.2014, he sold the land to the complainant's wife.

5. Despite being granted an opportunity to repay the amount received or to resolve the dispute, petitioner has expressed his inability to do so. However, there appears to be no denial of the factual position, as he himself has taken this stand in paragraph 8 of the petition.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances in its entirety, it appears that petitioner has likely duped the complainant's wife and is not entitled to any discretionary relief. Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

23.02.2026
Rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: YES/NO