

CRM-M-2562-2025
202

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2562-2025

Decided on: 21.05.2025

Mrs. Parminder Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CRM-M-5698-2025

Gurpreet Singh alias Gurprit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. A.P.S. Shergill, Advocate and
Ms. Harkiran Bajwa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manpreet Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0246	22.11.2024	City Moga	419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120B IPC and 506 IPC

1. This order shall dispose of two petitions as mentioned above. For the sake of brevity facts have been taken from *CRM-M-2562-2025 titled as Mrs. Parminder Kaur vs. State of Punjab.*
2. The petitioner(s) incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
3. In paragraph 23 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents.



CRM-M-2562-2025

4. Petitioners' counsel submits that civil proceedings are going on and currently petitioners are on interim bail, granted vide a detailed order dated 21.03.2025 (in CRM-M-2562-2025) and 03.04.2025 (in CRM-M-5698-2025) passed by coordinate Bench of this Court. On instructions, counsel further submits that petitioners would fully cooperate in case further investigation is ordered and he would not repeat the offence and would not involve himself in the offence where sentence is more than seven years and if he does so, he has no objection if State files application for cancellation of bail before the trial Court. The petitioners' counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioners and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply. Counsel for the complainant submits that a NRI lady was cheated and a massive amount of land was fraudulently transferred. Complainant's counsel further submits that in the photograph, original land owner was not there and it is a open and shut case of cheating and impersonation. Complainant's counsel further submits that they are least interested in petitioners' custody but their primary objective is restoration of lawful rights which they were deprived of.

6. Given the above arguments, let the investigator conduct the investigation, if not conducted already qua all the documents which were forged if any. It is clarified that in the further investigation, it shall be permissible for the complainant as well as the accused to handover their documents to the investigator, which shall be duly investigated.

7. Both the petitioners are granted interim bail after a custody of more than three months and both are senior citizen. As such, no ground is made out to cancel interim bail.

8. **Given above, petitions are allowed** and orders dated 21.03.2025 (in CRM-M-2562-2025) and 03.04.2025 (in CRM-M-5698-2025) are made absolute. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

21.05.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.