



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

135-1

CRM-M-71024-2025 (O&M)

Decided on : 23.03.2026

Raj Kumar Bhatia

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. S.S. Narula, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sidharth Grover, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate and
Mr. Tejasvi Sheokand, Advocate
for the complainant(s).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Raj Kumar Bhatia, aged about 62 years	0274	05.11.2025	120-B, 406, 420 of IPC	Sector 14	Panchkula.

2. In the present case, on 16.12.2025, following order was passed:-

“2. Petitioner is 62 years of age and, as per the Pehrvi report, is not shown to be involved in any other case of a similar nature. He is an Advocate by profession.

3. As per the allegations, plot in question was valued at approximately Rs.2.5 crores, and complainant was allured to purchase it for a sum of Rs.1.5 crores and extracted Rs.47,05,000/- from him.



Petitioner is stated to have paid his share amounting to Rs.23 lakhs towards the said transaction.

Role attributed to the petitioner is limited to introducing the parties to the seller and explaining the contents of the Will. However, as noticed in the Crime Branch report (Annexure P-5), it is alleged that petitioner prepared a forged Will pertaining to the disputed House No.233, Sector 26, Panchkula, in the name of Alka Thakur, resident of Delhi. On the basis of the said Will, deal was allegedly finalized at the price Rs.2 crores below the prevailing market value, thereby cheating the complainant for an amount of Rs.47,05,000/-.

4. *Notice of motion for 14.01.2026.*

5. *Meanwhile, petitioner shall not be arrested. However, issue of joining of investigation by the petitioner would be examined on the next date of hearing, after reviewing the status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel.”*

3. As per allegations, the same residential property, i.e., House No.233, Sector 26, Panchkula, on the strength of a Will, was agreed to be purchased by the complainant – Surender Singh, who at the relevant time (from 16.03.2022 to 06.10.2023) was posted as Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sector 14, Panchkula.

4. Primarily, there are six accused, namely, (i) Bharat Pal, (ii) Aarti Devi (sister-in-law), (iii) Naib Singh (son), (iv) Sukhwinder Kaur (daughter-in-law), (v) Kulwinder Singh Puwel (in possession of the property), and (vi) Raj Kumar Bhatia, Advocate (petitioner herein).

Property, which was valued at Rs.2.5 crores, allured for its sale to the complainant for a sum of Rs.1.5 crore. For finalizing the sale, an amount of Rs.53,05,000/- was paid by the complainant to accused Bharat Pal and his family members, including Naib Singh and Sukhwinder Kaur. Later, an amount of Rs.6.00 lakhs was returned by Bharat Pal and, therefore, at the time of registration of the FIR, a sum of Rs.47,05,000/- remained with the



accused persons.

5. During the course of hearing, it is informed that accused – Bharat Pal has been arrested and is presently inside the jail. It is further noticed that an amount of Rs.15.00 lakhs was credited into the bank account of Sukhwinder Kaur by the complainant, whereas an amount of Rs.10.00 lakhs was received in the account of the petitioner – Raj Kumar Bhatia.

6. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that in about 10–12 cases, the petitioner has represented accused – Bharat Pal, including some civil matters, details whereof have been appended as Annexure P-7, and same are reproduced here-under also for reference:-

1. *CS/394/2021 SHER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S SARPANCH AT KURUKSHTRA CIVIL COURT.*
2. *CS/865/2021 SHER SINGH AND OTHERS V/S ST.OF HARYANA & OTHERS -DO-(PENDING)*
3. *SUIT IN DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR OWNERSHIP -DO-*
4. *GIRDAWARI CASE BEFORE ASSISTANT COLLECTOR KURUKSHTRA (DECIDED)*
5. *REVISION PETITION BEFORE COMMISSIONER AMBALA DIVISION (DECIDED)*
6. *COMPLAINT AGAINEST RAJINDER SARPANCH (TWO CASES) ONE PENDING AT KUK*
7. *CWP BALJIT SON OF BHARAT PAL V/S STATE OF HARYANA DECIDED HIGH COURT.*
8. *STATE VS MUKESH DEVI FIR NO 385/2020 PENDING AT KURUKSHTRA.*
9. *MUKESH DEVI V/S STATE CRM-M-1132 OF 2023 IN HIGH COURT (DISPOSED).*
10. *MUKESH DEVI V/S STATE CRM-M-6082 OF 2025 IN HIGH COURT (PENDING)*
11. *KHAJAN SINGH V/S STATE CRM-M-5641 OF 2023 IN HIGH COURT (PENDING)*
12. *CIVIL SUIT ENGAGED BY BHARATPAL AND DRAFTED*



LATERON FILED THROUGH OTHER COUNSEL

13. *SOLD 120 CAR @4,80000 TO BHARATPAL*
14. *SOLD TATA SAFARI @3,50000 TO BHARAT PAL*
15. *CASH TAKEN TIME TO TIME BY BHARATPAL DUE TO CLIENT AND FAMILY RELATION*

7. Continuing his submissions, learned Senior counsel further submits that prior to registration of the FIR, several inquiries were conducted, wherein it was concluded that the dispute is essentially civil in nature. It is submitted that the Will relied upon by the co-accused was in possession of co-owner Alka Thakur and the original Will dated 30.07.2021 allegedly executed by Devender Singh Mann already stands submitted in a civil suit pending before the Court of learned ACJ (SD), Panchkula, where the said issue is under adjudication.

Thus, it is argued that the petitioner, being a professional Advocate, should not be subjected to custodial interrogation merely on the basis of assumptions, especially when he is ready to join the investigation and cooperate with the Investigating Agency.

8. On the other hand, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant submit that the petitioner is a main culprit, who, being a professional Advocate, facilitated the commission of the offence in connivance with the co-accused, thereby duping the complainant of a substantial amount.

9. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

10. Undisputedly, the alleged amount received by the petitioner is Rs.10.00 lakhs, for which a defence has been taken that the same pertains to professional services rendered to the co-accused.



11. At this stage, learned counsel for the complainant submits that the petitioner is involved in another case also of a similar nature, i.e., FIR No.16 dated 19.07.2016 under Sections 120-B, 417, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC, registered at P.S. CBI/ACB, Chandigarh.

In response thereto, learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was involved in the said case in his personal capacity and the trial therein is still pending. It is further pointed out that initially, the complaint in the said case was filed by the petitioner himself.

12. Be that as it may. Noticing the aspect that the main accused – Bharat Pal is already arrested and is presently inside the jail, and that a substantial amount i.e. Rs.28.00 lakhs (Rs.30.00 lakhs, as per the complainant) has been received by him, however, he has paid back Rs.6.00 lacs to complainant, this Court does not find any substantial reason to subject the petitioner to custodial interrogation. Whether the defence taken by the petitioner is true or false is a matter to be established during the course of trial, and at this stage, this Court is not required to go into the said aspect. The allegations against the petitioner are primarily based on documentary evidence, i.e., Will dated 28.07.2021 and same is already subject matter of adjudication before the Civil Court.

13. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, without commenting upon the merits, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

14. Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on



anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

15. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

16. With the directions issued here above, **present petition stands disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 23, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: ✓ Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: ✓ Yes/~~No~~