



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13993-2025
DECIDED ON: 17.03.2025

SANGRAMPREET SINGH

....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. PBS Goraya, Advocate,
Mr. SPS Sandhu and Mr. S.S. Bhullar, Advocates
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Relief sought

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking Anticipatory bail in FIR No. 10 dated 01.04.2024 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 201, 120-B, 34 of IPC registered at Police station PS NRI, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“As per allegations, complainant Karampreet Singh presented application before Sh. Kuldeep Singh Dhaliwal, NRI Cabinet Minister, Chandigarh on the allegations that complainant is residing abroad and he is having land at village Choudharywala, Tarn Taran. He also mentioned in that application that his grandfather Jalwant Singh was having land measuring 28 Kanal 14 Marlas in village Choudharywala. His grandfather has already expired. Accused Kanwalpreet Singh is paternal uncle of complainant. While Rajwant Kaur, Sangrampreet Singh are

paternal aunt and brother of complainant. Accused Kanwalpreet Singh got executed fake power of attorney by way of impersonation for Jalwant Singh grandfather of complainant, in-connivance with rest of the accused. While accused Tarsem Singh Lambardar and Kulwant Singh attested that fake general power of attorney. Accused persons were not having good terms with Jalwant Singh. On that account, they got executed fake power of attorney of Jalwant Singh by way of impersonation on 19.04.2022 and even fake Aadhaar card was prepared for that purpose and that power of attorney was got registered at Amnitsar on 19.04.2022. It is also alleged in that application that on the basis of that fake power of attorney Kanwalpreet Singh got transferred land measuring 20 Kanals 18 Marlas in favour of his wite Rajwant Kaur vide sale deed dated 21.04.2022 and he further got transferred land measuring 7 Kanals 16 Marlas in favour of his nephew Sangrampreet Singh vide sale deed dated 21.04.2022. While accused Gurbachan Singh did forgery in the Aadhaar card of Jalwant Singh by affixing his photo on that Aadhaar card and that aspect was transpired upon the statement of Darshan Singh Lambardar and Mandeep Singh Sarpanch. Detailed enquiries were conducted on the basis of such allegations and ultimately case was registered for offences under Sections 419, 420, 465, etc. IPC read with Section 34 IPC against Kanwalpreet Singh, etc."

3. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the complainant are real brothers, and the dispute in question pertains to the transfer of 20 kanals 18 marlas of land, which is reportedly registered in the name of Rajwant Kaur, the wife of the co-accused, who subsequently transferred 7 kanals 16 marlas of this land to the petitioner through a sale

deed dated 21.04.2022. The transaction is alleged to have been carried out using a forged *Power of Attorney* purportedly created in the name of the petitioner's grandfather, Jalwant Singh. Additionally, there is an ongoing civil litigation between the parties. He further contends that co-accused namely Rajwant Kaur, Kanwalpreet Singh, Gurbachan Singh and Kulwant Singh have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail or regular bail vide orders dated 10.02.2025, 28.02.2025, 04.02.2025 and 14.02.2025 passed in CRM-M-7485-2025 (Annexure P-1), CRM-M-8490-2025 (Annexure P-2), CRM-M-5491-2025 (Annexure P-3) and CRM-M-7521-2025 (Annexure P-4) respectively.

It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that he is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State, who seeks dismissal of the instant petition on the ground that the petitioner is the direct beneficiary of the transaction under dispute as some of the land was also transferred in his favour on the basis of fake and forged *Power of Attorney*.

4. Analysis

Be that as it may, looking into the nature of allegations and the relationship between the parties added to the fact that the case revolves around *power of attorney* wherein the findings are yet to be returned by the Civil Court qua its forgery and on that account, the petitioner's custody at this stage would be unfair and abuse of process of law.

Additionally, the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating officer concerned, as has been averred by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. **Relief**

In the light of above, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to him joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) of Cr.P.C which are reproduced below :-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 437, as if the bail were granted under that section.

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

17.03.2025

Poonam Negi

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No