



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

101

CRM-M-45263-2024

Date of decision: 19.09.2024

Gurpiar Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present : Mr. Aminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.151 dated 15.07.2024 under Sections 419/420/465/467/468/471/120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, which on the face of it is purely of a civil nature. It has been further submitted that the petitioner is a *bonafide* purchaser of the property in question which he had purchased vide a sale deed after paying full consideration and following the procedure envisaged. It has still further been submitted that the complainant, with an oblique motive, was arm twisting the petitioner and, hence, he deserved to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

3. Notice of motion.



CRM-M-45263-2024

-2-

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

5. At this stage, P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate has entered appearance and filed his power of attorney on behalf of the complainant which is taken on record.

6. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, have vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by counsel opposite, by submitting that the petitioner along with the co-accused purchased the property belonging to the complainant on the basis of forged and fabricated documents. Furthermore, it is not for the first time that the petitioner has been involved in such like crimes and rather is a habitual offender as it is a matter of record that he is involved in two other criminal cases. Learned State counsel has further submitted on instructions that in view of the previous criminal antecedents of the petitioner and the factum of the same having been withheld from this Court in the petition, he does not deserve the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail, and further his custodial interrogation would be necessitated to ascertain the entire *modus operandi* of all the accused.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. Prima facie, there are serious allegations against the petitioner, who, in collusion with other co-accused and officials of the revenue department, allegedly prepared false and fabricated jamabandis and mutations, and subsequently on the basis of these forged

**CRM-M-45263-2024**

documents, facilitated the transfer of the complainant's property. In addition, it is evident that the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands as the factum of his involvement in two other cases under the IPC has been concealed by him in the present petition.

9. In view of the seriousness of the allegations levelled coupled with criminal antecedents of the petitioner, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to him.

10. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

11. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**19.09.2024**

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE**

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