



137

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

**CRM-M-73533-2025
DECIDED ON: 09.03.2026**

ANKUR GOEL**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Aashish Bishnoi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.0774, dated 11.11.2025, under Sections 361(2), 318(4) and 3(5) of BNS, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Karnal.

2. After hearing submissions addressed on behalf of counsel for the petitioner, on 24.12.2025, following order was passed:-

“2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that, inadvertently, Section 361(2) of the BNS has been mentioned in the headnote and the prayer clause of the petition, whereas it ought to have been mentioned as Section 316(2) of the BNS.

3. It will be open to the petitioner to seek correction of the mention of the said Section in the headnote and the prayer clause of the petition, as pointed out.

4. *FIR in question has been registered at the instance of ICICI Bank, alleging that it has been defrauded of an amount of Rs.2.27 crores, as the petitioner succeeded in obtaining a loan by concealing the fact that the property in question was already under litigation.*

5. *Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the dispute is primarily of a civil nature, as the previous owners from whom the property was purchased vide sale deed dated 06.05.2025 (registered on 07.05.2025) never disclosed the said fact to the petitioner. It is further submitted that mutation in respect of the purchased plot measuring 604 square yards was also entered/sanctioned on 14.05.2025. Even a no-dues certificate was issued by the Municipal Committee/Corporation on 15.05.2025*

6. *Notice of motion.*

On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sajiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State. He seeks some time to file reply. Mr. Rishab Gupta, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent/Bank.

7. *To enable learned State counsel to file a status report detailing the allegations in chronological order and the evidence collected, showing petitioner's knowledge of the pendency of other cases/litigation in respect of the property purchased by him, list on 08.01.2026.*

8. *Till the next date of hearing, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. However, the issue of the petitioner joining the investigation will be examined after considering the reply of the respondents.*

9. *To be shown in the urgent list.*

10. *To be heard alongwith CRM-M-72033-2025."*

3. Thereafter, on 06.02.2026, following order was passed by this Court:-

"1. During the course of short hearing, certain facts have been clarified by Mr. Rishabh Gupta, Advocate, representing the complainant – ICICI Home Finance Company Ltd., that a loan amount of Rs.2,31,17,187/- was released in the month of April 2025 in favour of four applicants, namely, (i) Ankur Goel s/o Jagdish Chand, (ii) Hema Bindal w/o Ankur Goel, (iii) Jagdish Chand, and (iv) Dayawanti

w/o Jagdish Chand. Subsequent thereto, the residential plot measuring 604 sq. yards, situated at Brahma Colony, Amin Road, Thanesar, Kurukshetra, was sold by its then owners, i.e., Puneet Gupta (petitioner in CRM-M-73955-2025) and Surender Mittal (petitioner in CRM-M-72033-2025), to the aforementioned loanes vide sale deed dated 07.05.2025.

2. The allegations, as pointed out by learned counsel for the complainant today before this Court, are that, in fact, all the accused persons in this case, including the loanes, were having knowledge of the defective title, and despite that, a false picture was projected before the Bank in conniving with each other, by lowering down the price of the property, and thereafter, the deal was struck after sanctioning of the loan amount.

However, the allegations have already been investigated and a final report qua two of the accused, i.e., Puneet Gupta and Surender Mittal (both petitioners herein), has already been submitted before the Court concerned. Therefore, the respective counsel for the aforesaid two petitioners pray that they be released on bail, as their custody is not warranted for any meaningful purpose.

3. Learned counsel further submit that the apprehension of the complainant Bank is without any basis, because neither is there any such allegation, nor did the petitioners ever contact the Bank for the purpose of obtaining the loan or to extend any favour to co-accused – Ankur Goel (petitioner in CRM-M-73533-2025) and his family members.

4. It is noticed that accused/petitioner – Ankur Goel is already on interim anticipatory bail. Therefore, after taking into consideration the explanation submitted today before this Court and the facts noticed here-above, **petitioners – Puneet Gupta (in CRM-M-73955-2025) and Surender Mittal (in CRM-M-72033-2025) are ordered to be released on interim regular bail in this case till the next date of hearing**, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

5. For further consideration, list again on **09.03.2026**.

To be taken up immediately after the urgent list on the date fixed.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.”

4. Today, on the very outset, counsel for the petitioner seeks withdrawal of the present petition.
5. Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

09.03.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No