



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

CRM-M-20412-2025

Date of Decision:02.05.2025

Ashok Kumar

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in a case FIR No. 27, dated 07.10.2022, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC and under Section 13(1)(d) read with 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station State Vigilance Bureau, Ambala District (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that main allegations levelled against the petitioner is that he had obtained the land in his favour on the basis of certain affidavits, even though he was not eligible for the land. Learned counsel further contends that in fact, the land in question was possessed by Jaswant Kaur wife of Mahender Singh, who had died. After her death, the petitioner, Rajender Kumar and Sunita Rani, all being Class-1 heirs of Jaswant Kaur, inherited the possession of land measuing 13 kanals. Even, Harman, co-villager was also in possession of 17 kanals of land and was an

eligible lessee. After his death, the possession was transferred in favour of Sukhdev Singh, Gulzar Singh, Kirpal Singh, Gurdial Singh, Kaka Singh, Shakuntala Devi, Rani @ Ranjit Kaur. The LRs of Harman had sworn an affidavit and made a statement before District Welfare Officer, Kaithal that the land of their shares may be transferred in favour of Jaswant Kaur, mother of the petitioner. Thus, 17 kanals of land was allotted by District Welfare Officer, Kaithal in favour of Jaswant Kaur, mother of the petitioner. Learned counsel further contends that since then the petitioner has been in cultivating possession of land in question and a civil dispute has been illegally converted into a criminal offence. Learned counsel further contends that the case is based on documentary evidence, which has already been collected by the police. He further contends that the investigation in the present case is almost complete. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 05.03.2025 and is in custody since then.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully in the present case.

5. The petitioner is in custody since 05.03.2025 and the investigation is complete in all respect. The documentary evidence has already been collected by the police and the custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose. The prosecution is yet to lead evidence before the Trial Court with regard to the involvement of the petitioner in the present case.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

02.05.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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