

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

224

**CRM-M-27036-2022**

**Date of Decision: 21.09.2022**

Puran Singh Nambardar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present: Mr. Navinder Jit Singh Dandiwal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Attri, AAG, Punjab,  
assisted by ASI Harvinder Singh.

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.2 dated 22.04.2022 (wrongly mentioned as 25.04.2022 in the order of the Court below) at Police Station NRI, Moga, District Moga, under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471 & 120-B IPC.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Sharanpreet Kaur, wherein it has been alleged that she alongwith Tarlochan Singh and Narinder Chawla is co-owner in possession of land measuring 4 kanals situated in Village Moga Mehla Singh-II. It has been alleged that she has been residing abroad and occasionally visits India and in her absence, Amrik Singh Hira used to look after their property. The complainant alleged that Amrik Singh Hira came to know that some persons were trying to grab the property of the complainant and disclosed the said fact to the

complainant and upon instructions of the complainant, Amrik Singh Hira checked the revenue record and came to know that the property was shown to have been sold to one Gurwinder Singh on the basis of a sale deed bearing registration No.2956 dated 28.10.2015 and mutation had also been sanctioned on the said basis.

3. The petitioner has been arrayed as an accused on account of the fact that he had attested the sale deed being Nambardar of the Village.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner knew the purchaser Gurwinder Singh and had identified him correctly and that in any case, he cannot be said to be the beneficiary of the alleged dubious transaction. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is a person aged about 60 years and has a clean record.
5. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner being a Nambardar of the village would know all the residents of the village and since the land in question is situated within the revenue limits of the village, the petitioner cannot take a stand that he did not know the seller who in fact was an imposter. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 5 months and that he is not involved in any other case.
6. This Court has considered rival submissions.
7. Without commenting anything as regards the merits of the case, but while noticing that the petitioner, who is aged about 60 years, has been behind bars for the last about 5 months and otherwise has a clean record, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as the

conclusion of trial will take some time. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**21.09.2022**

Vimal

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)**  
**JUDGE**

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