



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-9880-2025

Date of decision: July 17th, 2025

Parveen Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Vanshika Daaria, Advocate
for Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.101 dated 12.04.2022 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. While issuing notice of motion on 20.02.2025, following submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner were recorded:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case for allegedly preparing a forged power of attorney in the name of Kishore Kumar (co-accused) and thereafter in connivance with other co-accused executing a sale deed in his favour, however, the petitioner is a bona fide purchaser of the land and had paid the entire sale consideration of approximately ₹9 lakh, on the basis of which the sale deed was registered.”

3. Thereafter, vide order dated 19.03.2025, the petitioner had

been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation. The relevant part of the said order reads as under:

“Learned State counsel while drawing the attention of this Court to the reply, which has been filed today, submits that although it was co-accused Kishore Kumar, who had got prepared a power of attorney of Pardeep Singh in his favour by getting him impersonated by some other person and thereafter had used the power of attorney in favour of one Barinder Singh, from whom he received an amount of 27 lakh, however, the petitioner was to be a direct beneficiary of the alleged transaction pertaining to the piece of land.

On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel as to whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, he, on instructions, has categorically replied in the negative.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 19.03.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Balwinder Singh, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 19.03.2025 is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482(2) BNSS.

July 17th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No