



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

CRM-M-19991-2025

Date of decision: 12th May, 2025

Gurdarshan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Pragyat Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.12 dated 01.02.2024 registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 511, 34 of the IPC, wherein he stands accused of having fraudulently procured General Power of Attorney in his favour by impersonating the complainant while the latter was residing abroad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case and has no role in the alleged forgery or impersonation. It is contended that the petitioner himself is a victim of fraud perpetrated by one Jaspal Singh, who was employed by the petitioner at the relevant time. Learned counsel has further submitted that the transaction in question pertained to an

exchange of land between the complainant and the petitioner, and the petitioner acted bona fide, relying on the representations made by Jaspal Singh. In support, attention of this Court has been drawn to Annexure P-2 and it has been urged that the petitioner had no knowledge of or involvement in the preparation of the forged General Power of Attorney, which was allegedly executed by Jaspal Singh without the knowledge of the petitioner.

3. It is further submitted that upon discovering the fraudulent acts of Jaspal Singh, the petitioner promptly initiated civil proceedings by way of a suit for permanent injunction against him. Learned counsel has reiterated that the petitioner is himself a victim of deceit, and has not derived any illegal gains from the impugned acts, which were allegedly carried out in collusion by Jaspal Singh and other co-accused.

4. On being put to notice, Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab on behalf of the State as well as Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate on behalf of the complainant have put in appearance and vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. By drawing the attention of the of this Court to the affidavit of Rishabh Bhola, IPS, ACP North Amritsar, it has been argued by the learned counsels that the petitioner is the principal conspirator and beneficiary of the alleged forgery. It has been submitted that a forged General Power of Attorney was executed in favor of the petitioner by impersonating the complainant, with the intent to take possession of the land of the complainant. Subsequently, the petitioner executed a Special Power of Attorney in favour of co-accused Jagtar Singh, thereby facilitating further illegal transfer and possession of the land in question.

5. Learned counsel for the State contends that the petitioner has played an active role in the commission of the offense and that the entire fraudulent transaction was orchestrated for his benefit. It has been further emphasized that the petitioner has not only derived a direct advantage from the impugned acts, but is also the primary accused named in the FIR.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

7. Prima facie, there are specific and serious allegations against the petitioner. The FIR (Annexure P-1) on its face, discloses that the petitioner is allegedly the direct beneficiary of the forged General Power of Attorney, purportedly executed by impersonating the complainant. It further emerges that the petitioner allegedly facilitated the transfer of the property of the complainant in his own name by relying on forged and fabricated documents. Therefore, in view of the serious and specific allegations, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the instant case. The petition stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

May 12, 2025
rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No