



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

**CRM-M-16264-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 20.04.2026**

RAM ROOP SHARMA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present: Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Jasmine Gill, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jangvir Singh Hooda, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J (ORAL)

1. The present is the first petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 740 dated 06.11.2025 registered under Sections 420, 120-B IPC (Sections 467, 468, 471 IPC added later on) (corresponding Sections 318(4), 61, 336(3), 337(2) and 340(2) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Camp Palwal, District Palwal, Haryana.

2. Vide order dated 24.03.2026, the petitioner was ordered to be released on interim bail, subject to his joining investigation and reporting to the Investigating Officer within one week, on certain conditions. The matter was adjourned for today i.e. 20.04.2026.



3. Today, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that as per the instructions received from the Investigating Officer, the petitioner has joined the investigation. However, it is contended that the petitioner is not giving answers to certain queries regarding the documents in question and, therefore, the order granting interim bail be not made absolute.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has duly joined the investigation and has fully cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record. As per the previous order, while granting interim bail to the petitioner, it was specifically observed that this Court was of the *prima facie* view that the dispute between the parties appears to be predominantly of civil nature, arising out of competing agreements to sell and subsequent transactions. The matter is largely based on documentary evidence and the question as to the validity and priority of the agreements is subject to adjudication before the competent civil Court. At this stage, custodial interrogation of the petitioner does not appear to be necessary.

6. In view of the aforesaid observations, merely because the petitioner is not in a position to answer certain queries regarding the documents or certain documents are yet to be produced, the same cannot be a ground to deny him the concession of bail, particularly when the case hinges upon documentary evidence, which can be collected and verified independently by the investigating agency. The petitioner has already joined the investigation and there is nothing on record to suggest that he has not cooperated or that his custodial interrogation is indispensable.



7. In view of the above, the interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 24.03.2026 is made absolute, subject to the terms and conditions already imposed.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of.

9. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

20.04.2026

Poonam Negi

**(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No