

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH****(I) CRM-M-52152-2022 (O&M)**

Harsher Singh &amp; others ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

**(II) CRM-M-59005-2022 (O&M)**

Ranjit Singh @ Ranjit Singh Patwari ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

**Date of Decision: 21.03.2023****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present: Mr. P.S.Hundal, Senior Advocate, with  
Mr. Vikrant Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner  
in CRM-M-52152-2022.

None for the petitioner in CRM-M-59005-2022.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mohit Kumar, Advocate, for the complainant.

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

1. This order shall dispose of aforesaid 2 petitions i.e. CRM-M-52152-2022 filed on behalf of Harsher Singh, Ramandeep Kaur & Rimplejeet Kaur as well as CRM-M-59005-2022 filed on behalf of Ranjit Singh @ Ranjit Singh Patwari, seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.20 dated 19.10.2022 at Police Station Vigilance

Bureau Range, Amritsar, under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Sections 420, 465, 468, 471 & 120-B IPC.

2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that land comprised in Khasra Murabba No.42 min, Village Darya Mansoor, Tehsil Ajnala, District Amritsar falls under the course of Ravi river and is owned by Punjab Government's Reclamation and Rehabilitation Department. River Ravi keeps on changing its course and sometimes the river flows over the said land and sometimes changes its course. Out of the total of 207 kanals of said land, land measuring 160 kanals is shown to be in possession of Brijnev Singh and Harsher Singh ever since before the year 1988. But as a matter of fact, 80 kanals of the said land has been proved to be in possession of complainant - Sukha Singh since the last 3-4 years, who had installed his tubewell, tap for irrigation and has been cultivating the said land. However, Brijnev Singh had been claiming that he had sold the said land to Sukhdeep Singh in the year 2009, but till date Brijnev Singh or Harsher Singh could not furnish any proof. Bachittar Singh father of Brijnev Singh and Harsher Singh had died on 24.03.2016. As per report No.176 dated 28.01.2020 issued by Tehsildar Ajnala to S.D.M. Ajnala, Amritsar, also it is Sukha Singh, who is stated to be in cultivating possession. About 47 kanals of land out of the total land measuring about 200 kanals comprised in khasra Murabba No.42 min, is shown in possession of Sukhdev Singh since the last 18-19 years.
3. Brijnev Singh, **Harsher Singh**, Sukhjit Singh and his two sons Prabhdeep Singh and Ravdeep Singh in connivance with three Patwaris namely Dalbir Singh, **Ranjit Singh** and Lakhbir Singh, who all had remained posted within the area of Patwar Circle Araj Daria, prepared a

fake *Girdawari* rectification while referring to a fake case No.143 dated 25.11.2015, got recorded a *roznamcha* report No.139 dated 13.01.2015 in respect of land measuring 80 kanals from 2015 onwards, so as to show Brijnev Singh and Ramandeep Kaur wife of Harsher Singh to be in possession in the revenue record. It is further alleged that another piece of land measuring 80 kanals was shown to be in *khasra Girdawari* in the name of Prabhdeep Singh, Ravdeep Singh sons of Sukhjit Singh during the period 2010 to 2015.

4. It is further alleged that the accused in connivance with Patwari Ranjit Singh and Patwari Lakhbir Singh got recorded report No.361 dated 10.08.2016 in the revenue record/*Girdawari* pertaining to the aforesaid 160 kanals on the basis of another fake *Girdawari* rectification No.28 dated 29.09.2015 and the names of Brijnev Singh, Ramandeep Kaur, Prabhdeep Singh and Ravdeep Singh were shown in the *Girdawari* register for the year 2010-2015 and with respect to Haadi 2016 and also got the same recorded in *jamabandi* for the year 2014-2015 in the column of cultivator/possession, whereas as a matter of fact it was Sukha Singh, who was in possession of 80 kanals of land and who had been cultivating the same. It is further alleged that similarly during the tenure of Patwari Dalbir Singh, entry regarding *Girdawari* rectification was entered vide report No.54 dated 21.10.2013 on the basis of a fake *Girdawari* rectification case No.136 dated 18.03.2013 and entries were recorded in respect of the same pieces of land in favour of Rimplejit Kaur wife of Brijnev Singh and Harsher Singh on the basis of fake case reference. Similarly, the *modus operandi* was adopted for the purpose of incorporating the name of Daljit Kaur daughter of Kulwinder Singh on

the basis of fake report No.49 dated 17.10.2013 by Patwari Lakhbir Singh.

5. It is further alleged that Patwari Lakhbir Singh and **Patwari Ranjit Singh** also adopted similar *modus operandi* so as to enter the name of Daljit Kaur daughter of Kulwinder Singh in the *Girdawari* register for the year 2010- 2015 and in the name of her father-in-law Sukhdev Singh. It is, thus, alleged that the three Patwaris namely Dalbir Singh, Lakhbir Singh and Ranjit Singh had forged the revenue record and on the basis of fake reports and orders, incorporated the names of Brijnev Singh, **Harsher Singh**, **Ramandeep Kaur**, **Rimplejit Kaur**, Prabhdeep Singh, Ravdeep Singh, Sukhjit Singh, Daljit Kaur and Sukhdev Singh for the purpose of recording  *khasra Girdawaris* in their names.
6. Learned counsel for the petitioner/s submitted that they have falsely been implicated in the present case and that the petitioners have been in possession of the land, which is duly reflected in the revenue record and as a matter of fact, no complaint whatsoever has ever been filed by the State of Punjab, who is reflected to be the owner of the said land and it is one Sukha, who is instrumental in lodging the FIR. Learned counsel have further submitted that the entire case is based on documentary evidence and as such, would not warrant any kind of custodial interrogation and as such, all the petitioners deserve to be granted anticipatory bail.
7. Opposing the petitions, learned State counsel submitted that it is a case where the revenue officials particularly three Patwaries, namely, Dalbir Singh, Ranjit Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-59005-2022) and Lakhbir Singh had forged the revenue record on the basis of fake and fabricated

reports so as to extent undue benefits to the petitioners and other co-accused and that as a matter of fact, the land in question vests with State of Punjab. Learned State counsel has further submitted that since the material record, wherein forged entries had been recorded is either missing or has been destroyed by the accused particularly the revenue officials, their custodial interrogation would be required and as such, no case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is made out. In support of his submissions, learned State counsel has also furnished a tabulated statement (in Punjabi) in respect of the changes effected in the revenue record accompanied by the supporting revenue documents (in Punjabi), which are taken on record.

8. This Court has considered the rival submissions.
9. It is evident that the land in question vests with State of Punjab, but apparently the same has been in possession of the private persons being a land, which is part of the river-bed of river Ravi, which keeps on changing its course.
10. A perusal of the tabulated statement furnished by learned State counsel shows that from 1994-95 upto 2005, it is Palwinder Singh S/o Mukhtar Singh, who is shown to be in possession of land, but subsequently in the *jamabandi* for the year 2009-10, the entry recorded in the column of possession is *Makbuja Malak* and the said entry as per the learned State counsel has been changed with the help of a 'pencil' only. Interestingly, in the next *jamabandi* recorded in 2014-2015, the possession is shown to be in favour of altogether new set of persons including Ramandeep Kaur wife of Harsher Singh. It is also borne out that the changes in the revenue record i.e. *jamabandi* for the year 2014-2015 have been recorded

on the basis of some Court orders stated to have been passed in Case No.143 dated 25.11.2015 and on the basis of which report No.139 dated 13.01.2015 was recorded in the *roznamcha*, whereas upon verification it has been found that there was no such case. Similarly, in *roznamcha* entry No.49 dated 17.10.2013 has been recorded on the basis of a purported order passed in Case No.126 dated 16.08.2013 though there is no such order.

11. The aforesaid facts would show that the revenue officials have entered forged and fabricated entries in the revenue record so as to extend benefits to some private individuals including the petitioners. Under these circumstances, Ranjit Singh – petitioner in CRM-M-59005-2022, who had remained as a Patwari and against whom there are specific allegations, does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and nor does Harsher Singh (petitioner No.1 in CRM-M-52152-2022) in whose favour or in favour of his wife some entries have been recorded. Thus, petition qua Harsher Singh (petitioner No.1 in CRM-M-52152-2022) also deserves to be declined.
12. Although as per the revenue record, Ramandeep Kaur and Rimplejeet Kaur (petitioners No.2 & 3 in CRM-M-52152-2022) are also reflected to be the beneficiaries, but it appears that most likely, it is their husbands i.e. co-accused Harsher Singh and Briznev Singh respectively, who had got the same done. In any case, both the said petitioners being ladies would stand on a different pedestal and can be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail mainly on account of the fact that they are ladies.
13. Consequently, while CRM-M-59005-2022 filed on behalf of Ranjit Singh and CRM-M-52152-2022 qua petitioner No.1 – Harsher Singh are

dismissed, CRM-M-52152-2022 qua petitioners No.2 & 3, namely, Ramandeep Kaur and Rimplejeet Kaur is hereby accepted and the interim directions issued by this Court vide order dated 12.12.2022 in CRM-M-52152-2022 are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that both the petitioners shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

14. A photocopy of this order be placed on all the connected file.

**21.03.2023**

Vimal

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

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

Whether reportable: **Yes/No**