



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

243

CRM-M-22239-2025

Date of Decision:-04.08.2025

Jagmohan Singh @ Jagdish Parsad

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Vikrampreet Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

H. S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.275 dated 01.11.2024 under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC registered at Police Station Sahnewal, District Ludhiana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner on the asking of Harjit Singh @ Joni, falsely impersonated as Jagdish Prasad, the actual owner of the land, who had passed away in 2016. The petitioner forged documents and got a sale deed executed of a land measuring 460 Sq. Yards moving forged documents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is an illiterate person and had done so on the asking of Harjit Singh @ Joni, his employer. However, Harjit Singh @ Jony, the beneficiary of the sale deed has been granted the concession of bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner also states that the petitioner is not the beneficiary from the said sale deed so



executed. Petitioner is in custody for about a period of 9 months and out of 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Status report dated 14.7.2025 by way of affidavit of Harjinder Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police (South), Police Commissionerate Ludhiana has been filed and the same is taken on record.

6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by stating that the petitioner has undergone custody for a period of 9 months and does not refute the fact that out of 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner for about a period of 9 months and also the fact that out of 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice and as the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.



CRM-M-22239-2025 (O&M) (3)

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

04.08.2025
geeta

(H. S. Grewal)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No