



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-47142-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-24.10.2024

Nanakjeet Arora @ Nanakjit ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate with
Mr. Prikshit Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate with
Mr. Gaurav Luhani, Advocate and
Ms. Rimjhim Mahajan, Advocate for the complainant.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
0079	18.6.2024	Cantonment, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar	420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 511, 120-B of Indian Penal Code

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of the aforementioned FIR.
2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that the accused had executed forged lease deeds for the purpose of tranferring possessory rights in respect of property of ‘Akhada Nirvansar’.



3. Short reply by way of affidavit of Shri Shivdarshan Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, West, Amritsar City has been filed by learned State counsel, which is taken on record.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is being involved in the present case on the ground that he had affixed his signatures in the capacity of a witness on the lease deeds/affidavit executed by Bharat Kumar i.e. lease deed dated 15.6.2021 (Annexure P-2), lease deed dated 23.3.2001 (Annexure P-3) and affidavit dated 18.9.2023 (Annexure P-4). It has been submitted that since the entire case is based on documentary evidence, his further detention, in any case, will not serve any useful purpose.
5. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant vehemently argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender having been involved in 8 other cases. It has further been submitted that the petitioner cannot be said to be a mere witness only to the agreement, but is closely related to Bharat Kumar being his paternal uncle and, as such, it is evident that he had actively connived and conspired with the co-accused for the purpose of execution of the fraud in question. Learned State counsel, however, informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 2 months.
6. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
7. Without commenting anything as regards merits of the case, but bearing in mind the fact that it is a case based mainly on documentary evidence and the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 2 months, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as conclusion of



CRM-M-47142-2024 (O&M) (3)

trial is likely to consume 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.

24.10.2024
Pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No