



107

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

**CRM-M-33595-2026
DECIDED ON: 11.06.2026**

VEER PAL AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Parvinder Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioners

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 93 dated 24.04.2026 under Section 420, 120-B IPC (Corresponding to 318 & 61 Of BNS) At Police Station City Rupnagar, District Rupnagar,

2 Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that they have been falsely implicated in the present case. He contends that the entire case arises out of a civil dispute, which has been given a criminal colour by the complainant. He further submits that the dispute emanates from an Agreement to Sell dated



12.05.2023, which was executed nearly five months prior to the stay order dated 26.10.2023.

Counsel further submits that the dispute essentially pertains to the possession and ownership of the property, matters that are founded upon documentary evidence and are predominantly civil in nature. He argues that no material has been brought on record to establish the petitioners' involvement in the alleged commission of the offences. Accordingly, he submits that the ingredients of the offences alleged against the petitioners are not made out.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Aftab Singh Khara, Sr. DAG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State, whereas Mr. Jaideep Verma, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed his Power of Attorney, which is taken on record.

Learned counsel appearing for the complainant prays for dismissal of the present petition. He submits that the petitioners were fully aware that the property in question had already been mutated in the names of Kamal Raj and Virpal on the basis of a registered Will dated 15.04.2008. Despite having knowledge of the said fact, the petitioners allegedly concealed the same and subsequently instituted a civil suit claiming rights over the property.

It is contended that, by asserting rights contrary to the existing mutation and the registered Will, the petitioners have sought to create a false claim over the property, thereby committing fraud.

3. **Analysis**

Considering that the primary allegations in the FIR pertain to a dispute regarding the possession and ownership of immovable property, and that



the controversy appears to be substantially founded on documentary evidence, which is already the subject matter of civil proceedings instituted by the complainant, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioners, wherein they have *bona fide* intentions and are ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioners are directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to their joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’



However, it is made clear that in case the petitioners do not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

11.06.2026

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No