



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

102-1

CRM-M No.3198 of 2025
Date of decision : 28.07.2025

Kulwinder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. R.S. Randhawa, Advocate and
Mr. Varun Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Bipan Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate and
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate
for the respondent No.2.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR
No.259 dated 19.12.2023 under Sections 177, 199, 200, 420, 120-B IPC
registered at Police Station Navi Baradari, District Jalandhar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that co-accused Sukhwinder Singh
had sold land measuring 16 kanals 18 marlas reflected in the jamabandi of the
year 2005-2006, vide registered sale deed on 19.12.2007 to the complainant. At
that time, an affidavit of co-sharer Nirmal Kaur was also given that she had no
objection if the said land was sold by co-accused, Sukhwinder Singh to the
complainant. Out of the said land, accused party had sold 4 kanals 5 marlas on
11.03.2013. Despite affidavit of Nirmal Kaur, the petitioner, in connivance with



co-accused, had got transferred the award money in the account of the petitioner-Kulwinder Singh. On 06.04.2021, District Revenue Officer, Jalandhar passed an award for acquisition of land. 215 marlas of land of the complainant was acquired by the Government, but he was given award money of only 52 marlas of land and the remaining amount had been claimed by the petitioner alongwith his co-accused by giving false affidavit that they were owners of the same.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by the complainant and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the complainant.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the allegations made against the petitioner are grave in nature and states that the petitioner has embezzled a large amount of money and as such, prays for dismissal of the anticipatory bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for both the parties and have considered the allegations against the petitioner. The petitioner alone has accepted an amount of compensation amounting to Rs. 5,22,56,000/- and has deprived the complainant of the amount as well as of the land and as such, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. In view of above, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the present petition stands dismissed.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

July 28, 2025
Sonia Puri

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

