



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

131

CRM-M-20586-2026

Date of decision: 20.07.2026

Date of uploading: 20.07.2026

Kartar Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Shobit Phutela, Ms. Kritima Sareen, and
Mr. Ravinder Singh Vohra, Advocates for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Mahima Yashpal Singla, Senior DAG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 23 dated 22.06.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 167, 218, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, at Police Station ACB Gurugram, District Gurugram.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that land measuring 13 Kanals 15 Marlas belonging to the Gram Panchayat of Village Pawala Khusrupur was acquired in the year 2008 for widening the road from Dwarka, Delhi to Village Kherki Daula. It has been alleged that the said Panchayat land had earlier been allotted on *patta* and, although Rattan Singh had cultivated the land only from the year 1979-80 to 1986, his name continued to be

CRM-M-20586-2026

reflected as the cultivator in the revenue record of the *Jamabandi* for the years 1982-1983 to 1997-1998, despite the land having subsequently been cultivated by different persons. Pursuant to official directions issued vide letter dated 11.03.1998, the entries in the Khasra Girdawari were corrected to record the cultivator as "Khudkasht Panchayat Deh Marfat Pattedar", and thereafter, in the *Jamabandi* for the year 2002-03, the entry of Panchayat Khudkasht was incorporated and the name of Rattan Singh was deleted. It is further alleged that, after publication of Award No.54 dated 05.11.2009 relating to the land acquisition compensation of several villages, including the disputed land measuring 13 Kanals 15 Marlas, Rattan Singh filed a reference petition under Sections 18 and 30 of the Land Acquisition Act. Although there was no proof of his ownership and Statement No.19 prepared under Section 18 did not mention him as a *Gair Marusi*, accused Kartar Singh, the then Patwari, is alleged to have fraudulently inserted the words in his own handwriting as "Rattan Singh son of Bhagwana son of Kheema, Gair Marusi" below the entry "Panchayat Deh" in the column of cultivation in the photocopy of Statement No.19, whereas no such entry existed in the original revenue record. The prosecution further alleges that, without conducting any preliminary verification regarding the genuineness of the reference, LAO Ram Avtar Gupta forwarded the reference petition to the District Judge, Gurugram, despite repeated opportunities when the revenue record could have been examined to ascertain its authenticity. It is alleged that the accused persons, acting in collusion with one another, facilitated the forwarding of the false reference, resulting in disbursement of ₹14,46,91,263/- as land acquisition compensation to the legal representatives of Rattan Singh, to

CRM-M-20586-2026

which they were not legally entitled, thereby causing a huge financial loss to the State exchequer. The investigation further revealed that accused Pinki and Aarti, daughters of Rattan Singh and Rajesh, wife of Rattan Singh, and Ram Avtar Gupta, the then Land Acquisition Officer, were found innocent by the Investigating Officer.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 19.02.2026. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the FIR in question emanates from the complaint received by the State Vigilance Bureau in the year 2019 and the FIR in question was registered in the year 2024. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that there is no allegation against the petitioner of non-cooperation with the investigating agency during this time. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the prosecution case is essentially based on documentary evidence and as per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner had forged the records on account of which the payment was disbursed to the L.Rs of the deceased—Rattan Lal, which was not in accordance with law. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the said L.Rs of deceased—Rattan Lal are not even arraigned as accused in the FIR in question. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has further urged that the petitioner is a man aged 59 years with clean antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. State has filed reply dated 09.07.2026 by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, SV & Anti-Corruption Bureau, Gurugram. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel has

CRM-M-20586-2026

opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 16.07.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 19.02.2026 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan has been presented on 26.04.2026 Total 23 witnesses have been cited and it is the concede position before this Court that none of the prosecution witness has been examined till date. It is not in dispute that the conclusion of trial will take long time. The rival contentions raised at the Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of the trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions at this stage, *lest* it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

As per custody certificate dated 16.07.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 4 months and 28 days & is not shown to be involved in any other FIR.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in

CRM-M-20586-2026

addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

20.07.2026
Naveen

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No