



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

(106-2)

CRM-M-67426-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision :27.07.2026

UMESH VEER VIKRAM SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, CHANDIGARH

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. APS Deol, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Dilpreet Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. R.S. Bagga, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Ravi Kamal Gupta, Spl. PP
for the respondent-CBI

Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Keerat Dhillon, Advocate for the complainant

MANISHA BATRA, J. (ORAL)

CRM-11319-2026

1. Application for placing on record is allowed subject to all just exceptions and the documents appended with the application are ordered to be placed on record as Annexure P-10 to P-12 respectively.

CRM-23473-2026

1. Application for placing on record is allowed subject to all just exceptions and the documents appended with the application are ordered to be placed on record as Annexure P-13 to P-14 respectively.

**CRM-M-67426-2025**

1. The instant petition has been petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short “BNSS”) for grant of regular bail in cases bearing RC No.0512023S00012 & RC No.0512023S00013 (For short RC-12 and RC-13 respectively) dated 15.11.2023 registered under Section 120-B read with Sections 452, 323, 506, 427, 148, 149, 408, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 193 of IPC at Police Station CBI, Special Crime Branch, Chandigarh.

2. Vide order dated 18.10.2023 passed in CRM-M-6340-2023, a direction had been issued by this Court to the respondent-CBI to conduct investigation in cases bearing FIR No.133 dated 10.03.2022 registered under Sections 452, 323, 506, 427, 120B, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar (Mohali) (For short “FIR No.133”) and case bearing FIR No.303 dated 04.10.2023 registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC at Police Station Dera Bassi, District SAS Nagar (Mohali) (For short “FIR No.303”).

3. FIR No.133 was lodged by Harjit Singh, Manager of Guru Nanak Vidhya Bhandar Trust, Daryaganj, New Delhi (now to be mentioned as “complainant Trust”), alleging therein that 32 bighas of land situated at Zirakpur Patiala Road had been purchased by the complainant-Trust in the year 1986 and it was in possession of the same. With intent to grab the said land, accused Sanjeev Kumar Gatha, Rajesh Kumar Gaba, Rajinder Kumar and Sarabjit Singh hatched a conspiracy with their accomplices and had got



registered a separate Trust with the name similar to that of the complainant Trust and had got prepared different documents. Inquiries were pending in different offices with regard to the said Trust. He alleged that on 10.03.2022, the accused Rajesh Kumar Gabba alongwith his 10-12 accomplices entered inside the land of the Trust by being armed with deadly weapons. The security guards standing at the gate of the said land were assaulted with weapons. Injuries were caused to them and their phones as well as CCTV cameras installed therein were damaged. Threats were extended to the guards and all this was done to take illegal possession of the land of the Trust. A Special Investigation Team (SIT) was constituted and charge-sheet was filed as against the co-accused Sanjeev Kumar Gatha, Rajesh Kumar Gaba and Manoj Kumar.

4. FIR No.303 was registered on the basis of complaint filed by Inder Deep alleging that accused Sanjeev Kumar Gatha, Rajesh Kumar, Sarabjit Singh and Rajinder Kumar had created and utilized forged documents to claim ownership and possession of the land owned by the complainant Trust.

5. After re-registration of both the above FIRs as RC No.12 and 13 respectively, the CBI had started conducted investigation. It was revealed during investigation that a fake Trust deed had been created by co-accused Rajesh Kumar Gaba, Sarabjit Singh, Rajinder Kumar and Sanjeev Kumar, as per which a Trust of the same name as that of the complainant-Trust was purportedly shown to be established on 07.03.1980 by Sona Ram and Harnam Singh. In connivance with Sub-Registrar Kuldeep Singh, a supplementary



trust deed was registered in 2021 based on the above-said forged and fake trust deed dated 07.03.1980.

6. It was revealed during investigation that the present petitioner by conniving with the co-accused, prepared a forged and fabricated order dated 18.03.1948 purported to have been issued in Special Appeal No.1 dated 18.03.1948. He also got prepared one fake society registration certificate in the name of the complainant Trust alongwith memorandum of articles having the stamp of NCT Delhi and had used the same in connivance with the co-accused to project that it was a genuine document. He also got prepared 02 Wills. Both these Wills were also found to be forged and fabricated as per the CFSL Report. First Will dated 16.02.1950 was purportedly made by Nauratta Singh shown to be executed in favour of Jagath Seth Hardyal Singh and the second Will dated 07.02.1951 was purportedly executed by Nauratta Singh and Ajit Singh in favour of Balbir Singh, who was father of the petitioner. By using those fake Wills and other documents and in connivance with the co-accused, the petitioner had got registered a lease deed of land owned by the genuine Trust i.e. the complainant-Trust in favour of accused Sanjeev Kumar Gaba. He did not respond to the summons and warrants issued by the CBI. Ultimately proceedings for declaring him a proclaimed offender/person had been initiated and he was declared as such vide order dated 15.07.2025. He surrendered before the Learned Trial Court on 18.08.2025. An application filed by him seeking bail has been dismissed by the Court of Learned Special Judge, CBI, Punjab, SAS Nagar (Mohali) vide order dated 31.10.2025.



7. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in either of the 02 FIRs Nos.133 and 303. He was not even named in RC No.12 and RC No.13 as registered by CBI. The original Trust in fact had been established on 07.03.1980 by Sona Ram, father of accused Rajinder Kumar and Harnam Singh father of accused Sarabjit Singh. Following the death of original trustees, a supplementary Trust deed was registered in the year 2021. He is the actual owner of the land in question on the basis of inheritance from his father Balbir Singh and has no relation with the complainant or the co-accused, both of whom are trying to usurp the land owned by him on the basis of forged documents. Nauratta Singh, the actual owner of the said land had executed Will in the name of his father, which was not registered. The petitioner had come to know about the documents relating to the land in question after the death of his father. He had handed over the original Wills to the CBI and has been nominated as accused on the ground that the Will executed by Nauratta Singh in favour of Jagath Seth and Hardy Singh is not genuine. He is in custody since 18.08.2025. The chances of conclusion of trial in the near future are bleak as only 02 out of 145 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. No useful purpose would be served by his further incarceration. On account of his involvement in some other cases, he cannot be denied benefit of bail in this case. The ingredients for commission of subject offences are not attracted qua him. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.



8. Per contra, learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI and learned Senior counsel for the complainant have argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. His antecedents are not clean as he is involved in 02 more cases of committing offences of cheating, forgery and criminal breach of trust. He had evaded the proclamation proceedings and was declared a proclaimed person. There are chances of his committing similar offences or intimidating the witnesses or tampering with the record, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

9. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

10. The petitioner is alleged to have claimed ownership of the land in question owned by the complainant-Trust on the basis of 02 Wills which have been found to be false and fabricated documents. He is also shown to have produced some documents, during investigation, as to dissolution of the genuine Trust, which are also alleged to have been forged and fabricated by him. These very documents were further used by the co-accused Rajesh Gaba and used for the purpose of claiming ownership with regard to the land in dispute. The active complicity of the petitioner in commission of the subject offences stands *prima facie* established. The allegations levelled against him are quite serious in nature. The antecedents of the petition are also not clean since as per the record, 02 cases with regard to property fraud had been registered against him. It is well-settled proposition of law that grant of bail is a discretionary relief to be granted or denied based on specific facts and



circumstances of each case. The factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the material witnesses is also to be weighed. Frivolity of prosecution should always be considered, and it is only the element of genuineness that has to be considered in the matter of grant of bail. Taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, finding no compelling ground to allow the present petition, the same is dismissed.

11. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

12. Since the main petition has been dismissed pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

27.07.2026
Amit Sharma

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