

HRSO010071772026



In the Court of Subhash Chander Sroai, Addl. Sessions Judge, Sonapat.
(UID:HR0494)

C.I.S. (B.A.) No.2033 of 2026
Date of Institution: 07.08.2026
Arguments heard on: 12.08.2026
Date of Order : 12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur, aged 36 years son of Rajinder Gaur, Resident of Shyam Vihar,
Phase 1, Najafgarh, Delhi.

...Applicant-accused

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent.

FIR No.36 dated 10.02.2025
Under Sections: 223A, 318(4), 61 Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023
Police Station: City, Sonapat

....
1st Regular Bail Application
....

Present: Shri Sumit Kumar Vats, counsel for the applicant-accused.
Ms. Roshni, Public Prosecutor for the respondent-
State.

ORDER:

This order shall dispose off an application for regular bail
filed by applicant-accused Ravi Gaur, aged 36 years son of Rajinder Gaur,
Resident of Shyam Vihar, Phase 1, Najafgarh, Delhi, in case FIR No.36
dated 10.02.2025, under Sections 223A, 318(4), 61 Bharatiya Nyaya

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana

2

Sanhita, 2023 , Police Station City, Sonapat.

2- Notice of the bail application was given to the respondent-State. Learned PP for the State has put his appearance on behalf of the respondent-State. Reply filed.

3- The present FIR No.36 dated 10.02.2025, under Sections 223A, 318(4), 61 Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 , Police Station City, Sonapat has been registered on the application No.2294/ST dated 05.12.2024 of Deputy Registrartion Officer and Sub Divisional Magistrate (Civil), Sonapat with subject:- regarding taking legal action for concealing facts/ furnishing wrong information while registering the documents, wherein it is stated that:

“ With reference to the above subject, in the matter under consideration, it is written that a document was presented in this office for registration on 15.10.2024 by Shri Pawan Dahiya, Advocate, Chamber 22A District Court Complex, Sonipat. The details of which are as follows:- Seller- 1. M/s Shining Construction Pvt. Ltd., Registered Office Flat No. 478. First Floor GH-9, Paschim Vihar, New Delhi. (Authorize Shri Shiv Kumar Kaushik son of Shri Rajender Kaushik,

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana

3

*resident of 16, Bihari Park, Deoli Road, Khanpur
South Delhi-110062)*

*Buyer:- M/s RRP Infrastructure Developers,
LLP, E-15 A, NEB SARI SAINIK FARMS NEW
DELHI-68 (Authorized Prashant Khadoori son of Shri
M. R. Khadoori, 84, resident of H. No. A-2340, Gate
No. 6, Green Field Colony, Bamar Nagar, Faridabad
121003, Haryana), Witness:- Shri Ravi Gaur son of
Shri Rajendra Gaur, resident of D-41, Near Krishna
Market, Shyam Vihar Phase-. Village Dindarpur,
Bapdauli, West Delhi-110043, land area 53 Kanal 4
Marla Village Rathdhana, Khewat No. 1007, Account
No. 1084.*

*The said documents were presented in
this office on 15.10.2024 by Shri Pawan Dahiya,
Advocate, Chamber No. 22 A, District Courts
Complex, Sonapat after drafting, for registration
which were registered after verification by the
concerned clerk. After registration, the documents
were handed over to the concerned person and*

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana

4

deposited the record in the Tehsil office.

When the said document No. 9413 dated 15.10.2024 was presented to Tehsildar Office, Sonipat for mutation, it was matched with the revenue record, then it came to the notice of the Tehsildar, Sonipat that the land mentioned in the document, area 53 Kanal 4 Marla, Khewat No. 1007, Account No. 1084, vide rapat No. 834 dated 31.08.2023, a stay order has been registered, on any type of land transfer. In this case, the full facts have been brought to the notice of the undersigned by the Tehsildar Sonipat. After the document no. 9413 was brought to the notice of the undersigned by the Tehsildar, the undersigned again perused the file and it was found that in column no. 2 of the check list attached with the document, in the absence of any stay order/attachment order of the competent court, Shri Pawan Dahiya, Advocate has written NO and no court stay is recorded in the Jamabandi attached with it. From which it is clear that Shri Pawan Dahiya, Advocate, Seller M/s Shining

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana

5

Construction Pvt. Ltd., Registered Office Flat No. 478, First Floor GH-1, Paschim Vihar, New Bihari Park, Deoli Road, Khanpur, South Delhi-110062) Buyer M/s RRP Infrastructure Developers, LLP, E-15A. NEB SARI SAINIK FARMS NEW DELHI 68 (Authorized Prashant Khaduri son of Shri M.R. Khaduri, resident of M.No. A Shyam Vihar, Phase-1. Village Dindarpur, Bapdauli, West Delhi-110043 has got the document number 9413 registered on 15.10.2024 by misleading the undersigned office by mutual conspiracy, with wrong intention, irregularly and by hiding facts in the Jamabandi, which completely comes under the category of fraud and forgery. Hence, it is written to you that, ensure to take legal action against Shri Pawan Dahiya Advocate, buyer, seller and witness for registering document No.9413 dated 15.10.2024 in a wrong manner by committing fraud and forgery.”

4- Argument heard.

5- It is argued by learned counsel for the applicant-accused that

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana**6**

the applicant-accused has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further argued that no wrongful gain has been occurred to the applicant-accused. It is further argued that investigation has been completed and police has already filed the charge-sheet. It is further argued that co-accused Naveen Kumar and Shiv Kumar Kaushik have been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 05.08.2026. It is further argued that applicant-accused is in custody since 12.02.2026 and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bar. He, thus, prayed that the present bail application be allowed.

6- Per contra, ld. Public Prosecutor for the State has strongly opposed the bail application arguing that the allegations against the applicant-accused are serious in nature. She, thus, prayed that the present bail application of the applicant-accused be dismissed.

7- I have given my thoughtful consideration to the argument advanced by both the parties and carefully gone through the file.

8- As per the prosecution case, there was land of PACL Group and his other sister concern i.e. M/s Shinning Construction and M/s World Wide Buildcon, in village Rathdhana, District Sonipat. Justice Lodha Committee constituted on the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court had issued a stay order on the transfer/sale of the land belonging to PACL.

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana**7**

However, applicant-accused alongwith other co-accused conspired and got registered the sale deed No.9413 dated 15.10.2024 in favour of RRP infrastructure developers LLP through co-accused Prashant Khanduri being authorized representative. Lateron, after getting passed resolution from RRP infrastructure, in favour of co-accused Prashant Khanduri the said sale deed was got cancelled, but during the investigation, the said resolution was found containing forged signature of Director Ranjana Devi Jain of RRP infrastructure through co-accused Prashant Khanduri. Applicant-accused is named in the FIR and he stood as an witness on the sale deed and he has received Rs.2,30,00,000/- cash from the amount given to Neeraj Birdi. Further, as per reply, Rs.40,000/- and one vehicle No.HR 03V-0019 Fortuner, which he has taken from Arun Dagar, R/o Ujwa, Delhi for five years, has been recovered. The allegations against the applicant-accused are serious in nature.

9. It is further argued that co-accused Naveen Kumar and Shiv Kumar Kaushik have been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 05.08.2026, so applicant-accused is also entitled for bail on the ground of parity.

Applicant-accused alongwith other co-accused conspired and got registered the sale deed No.9413 dated 15.10.2024 in favour of

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana

8

RRP infrastructure developers LLP through co-accused Prashant Khanduri being authorized representative. Lateron, after getting passed resolution from RRP infrastructure, in favour of co-accused Prashant Khanduri the said sale deed was got cancelled, but during the investigation, the said resolution was found containing forged signature of Director Ranjana Devi Jain of RRP infrastructure through co-accused Prashant Khanduri. Applicant-accused is named in the FIR and he stood as an witness on the sale deed and he has received Rs.2,30,00,000/- cash from the amount given to Neeraj Birdi. Further, as per reply, Rs.40,000/- and one vehicle No.HR 03V-0019 Fortuner, which he has taken from Arun Dagar, R/o Ujwa, Delhi for five years, has been recovered. So, there is no parity between applicant-accused and co-accused Naveen Kumar and Shiv Kumar Kaushik, who have been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, vide order dated 05.08.2026. Hence, the contention of the Ld. Counsel for the applicant-accused is not tenable.

10. So, keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, the applicant-accused is not entitled for bail. Hence, the present bail application filed by the applicant-accused is hereby **dismissed**.

11- However, nothing mentioned herein above shall tantamount to expressing of any opinion on the merits of the case and shall not affect

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana

9

any of the party during the trial.

Papers be tagged with main case file.

Pronounced in open Court.

Pronounced in open Court.

Dated: 12.08.2026.

(Subhash Chander Sroai),
Additional Sessions Judge,
Sonapat.UID:HR0494.

Note: This order consists of 9 pages and each page
has been duly checked and signed by me.

(Subhash Chander Sroai),
Additional Sessions Judge,
Sonapat.UID:HR0494.

Parveen Kumar, Stenographer Gr.II.

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026

Ravi Gaur Versus State of Haryana

10

Present: Shri Sumit Kumar Vats, counsel for the applicant-accused.
Ms. Roshni, Public Prosecutor for the respondent-State.

Arguments on bail application heard.

Vide my separate order of even date, the present bail application has been **dismissed**.

Papers be tagged with main case file.

Pronounced in open Court.
Dated: 12.08.2026.

(Subhash Chander Sroai),
Additional Sessions Judge,
Sonapat. UID:HR0494.

Typed by:
Parveen Kumar, Stenographer Gr.II

(Subhash Chander Sroai)
ASJ, Sonapat (UIR:HR0494)
12.08.2026