



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

104

CRM-M-21198-2025

Date of decision: April 30th, 2025

Karnail Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Jasvir Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.9 dated 18.03.2025 under Sections 13(2), 13(1)(A) of The Prevention of Corruption Act and Sections 409, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station State Vigilance Bureua, District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case, which arises out of allegations that he, in connivance with co-accused Kulvir Singh, Patwari, tampered with the revenue records and facilitated the preparation of a forged report, whereby compensation was awarded to the wife of the petitioner, allegedly without legal entitlement. It is contended that the petitioner shares estranged matrimonial relations with his wife i.e. the complainant, and has no concern with the compensation amount, which was neither deposited in his account nor received by him in any manner. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is not the beneficiary of the alleged transaction, nor has he

been entrusted with any public funds, and that the criminal proceedings are an outcome of a personal vendetta arising from matrimonial discord.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. H.S. Deol, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent.

5. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR (Annexure P-1) and submitted that the same are grave and serious in nature. It has been further submitted, on instructions, that the petitioner, who is related to co-accused Kulvir Singh, Patwari, acted in collusion with the said public servant to tamper with the official revenue records and to illegally secure compensation not only for the wife of the petitioner but also for relatives of the said Patwari. Learned State counsel has further asserted, on instructions, that the petitioner played an active role in the commission of the offence and the material collected during the preliminary investigation *prima facie* points towards his complicity.

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

7. A bare perusal of the FIR reveals specific allegations attributing an active role to the petitioner in the preparation of tampered revenue records, allegedly in conspiracy with a public servant, for the purpose of extending illegal monetary benefits to close relatives, including his own spouse. The nature of the allegations, which pertain to interference with official records and misuse of a

Government Scheme for personal gain, are *prima facie* serious and require thorough investigation.

8. The contention of matrimonial discord, as raised by the petitioner, may have some bearing on the credibility of the motives of the complainant, but it does not, at this stage, negate the gravity of the allegations or absolve the petitioner from scrutiny in the investigative process, especially when the allegations suggest a concerted act of manipulation of public records and wrongful conferment of pecuniary advantage.

9. In view of the nature of allegations and the role attribute to the petitioner, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to him.

10. The instant petition, therefore, stands dismissed.

11. 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.

April 30th, 2025

Puneet

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No