



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

138

1.

CRM-M-36297-2025 (O&M)**Date of decision: 14.07.2025**

Paramvir Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Central Bureau of Investigation

.....Respondent

2.

CRM-M-36629-2025**Date of decision: 14.07.2025**

Umesh Veer Vikram Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Central Bureau of Investigation

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Jasdev Singh Mehndiratta, Advocate and
Mr. Umaid Singh Mann, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-36297-2025.

Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-36629-2025.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. This common order shall dispose of abovementioned petitions seeking anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') filed by petitioners-Paramvir Singh and Umesh Veer Vikram Singh, who are accused in FIR No.RC-0512023S00012 and RC-0512023S00013 dated 15.11.2023 registered under Section 120-B read with Sections 452, 323, 506, 427, 148, 149, 408, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 193 of the IPC, at Police Station CBI, SCB, Chandigarh.

**Submissions on Behalf of Petitioner-Paramvir Singh**

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated. It is contended that while serving as a clerk in the office of the Registrar of Firms and Societies, the petitioner merely acted on the instructions of his superiors, and lacked any culpable intent or knowledge regarding the alleged forged documents.

3. While drawing the attention of this Court to the final report, annexed as Annexure P-9, learned counsel has argued that the only role attributed to the petitioner in the FIR in question is his alleged connivance with co-accused Neeraj Kumar Singhal in producing certain documents during the adjudication of a case, Kavita Vs. Mamta, and allegedly rendering a false statement before the learned Trial Court. Learned counsel has pointed out that one Gaurav Bandu, stated to be similarly situated, has not been arrayed as an accused, thus raising questions on the selective approach adopted by the investigating agency/CBI.

4. Learned counsel further contends that the testimony of the petitioner holds little evidentiary value in view of the documentary record already on file. Furthermore, the statement in question would be barred under Sections 91 and 92 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, and that the petitioner is neither a beneficiary of the alleged conspiracy nor is any recovery to be made at his instance.

5. A plea is thus made for extending the concession of anticipatory bail, moreso when the petitioner has no previous criminal



antecedents.

Submissions on Behalf of Petitioner-Umesh Veer Vikram Singh

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he is a victim of false implication, and no specific role or overt-act has been attributed to him in the FIR in question. It has been contended that the petitioner is the lawful successor to one Naurata Singh, and is the rightful owner of the property in question, by virtue of two wills dated 16.02.1950 and 12.12.1952, annexed as Annexures P-5 and P-6, respectively.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also challenged the legitimacy of the complainant-trust, contending that the registration certificates relied upon are fabricated, devoid of signatures of the registering authority, and do not even have any registration number assigned to it.

8. Notice of motion in both cases.

9. On asking of the Court, Mr. Ravi Kamal Gupta, Special Public Prosecutor for the CBI, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-CBI in both the cases.

10. Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate along with Mr. Keerat S. Dhillon, Advocate, has entered appearance and filed his separate power of attorneys in both the cases on behalf of the complainant-trust, which are taken on record.

11. Learned Special Public Prosecutor, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, have vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. It has been submitted that



both the petitioners are key participants in a wide-ranging and deep-rooted conspiracy to fraudulently acquire charitable property by forging documents, manipulating public records, and producing false testimony in judicial proceedings.

12. While drawing the attention of this Court to the final report (Annexure P-9), it has been further submitted that petitioner Paramvir Singh, while posted as a clerk, misused his official position to introduce fabricated documents into judicial proceedings and gave false evidence in the case of Kavita Vs. Mamta, thereby attempting to establish the credibility of forged records in favour of the principal accused.

13. It has still further been pointed out that the magnitude of the fraud extended to the connivance of various public servants, including bank personnel, police officers, judicial officers, and revenue officials, suggesting a systemic abuse of the Court of law. Learned counsels have vehemently argued that such fraudulent conduct by the petitioners has undermined public trust in the criminal justice system.

14. Significantly, it has also been brought to the notice of this Court by the learned counsel for the complainant, as well as learned Special Public Prosecutor for the CBI, that proceedings under 82 of the Cr.P.C./84 of the BNSS have already been initiated against both petitioners vide order dated 10.06.2025, following repeated non-compliance with bailable and non-bailable warrants. Despite sufficient opportunities, the petitioners have failed to present themselves before the learned Trial Court.

15. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the



complainant has placed reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***Srikanth Upadhyay & others Vs. State of Bihar & another : 2024 AIR Supreme Court 1600***, wherein it was held that grant of anticipatory bail should not be resorted to as a matter of routine, especially in cases involving proclamation proceedings or where custodial interrogation of an accused may be warranted. It has been further submitted that petitioner Umesh Veer Vikram Singh has earlier approached this Court vide CRM-M-23906-2025, challenging order dated 17.05.2025 passed by the learned Trial Court whereby non-bailable warrants were issued against him, which was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 02.05.2025 when this Court was not inclined to accept the prayer of the petitioner.

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

17. The allegations, *prima facie*, disclose a deeply embedded conspiracy involving the systematic forging of legal documents, wrongful usurpation of land belonging to a charitable trust, and manipulation of official proceedings. The role attributed to both petitioners is not peripheral, but foundational to the execution of the alleged conspiracy.

18. The petitioners in active collusion with various co-accused from different departments such as the revenue officials, banking personnels, practicing advocate, registrar, police officers and even judicial officers executed a premeditated scheme to grab approximately 08 acres of valuable land belonging to the trust-Guru Nanak Vidya



Bhandar Trust by preparing forged and fabricated documents and manipulating legal procedure.

19. Insofar as the submission of false testimony by petitioner Paramvir Singh is concerned, the same was not merely in a private or irrelevant dispute, but in furtherance of a fraudulent claim, and served to vitiate the judicial process itself. His alleged active involvement in creating a facade of legitimacy around forged documents cannot be ignored or downplayed.

20. Similarly, the contention by learned counsel for the petitioner Umesh Veer Vikram Singh, being a *bonafide* successor lacks evidentiary support at this stage, particularly when the very documents relied upon by him are under serious dispute and alleged to be fabrications. The allegation regarding forged trust registration certificates further suggests a broader manipulation, warranting a thorough custodial interrogation.

21. More importantly, the institution of proceedings under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C/84 of the BNSS against the petitioners is a clear indication of their non-cooperation. A bare perusal of the zimni orders leave no manner of doubt that despite the several opportunities to appear throughailable/non-bailable warrants granted to the petitioners, they have miserably failed to appear till date. Hon'ble the Supreme Court has consistently held that once an accused is declared a proclaimed offender or fails to comply with process, the extraordinary concession under section 438 of the Cr.P.C. should ordinarily be denied.



22. The law is well settled that anticipatory bail in cases involving serious economic offences or frauds of a large scale must be granted only in rare and exceptional cases. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in multiple decisions has emphasised that economic offences pose a serious threat to the financial health of the nation and public trust and institutions, and thus require stricter scrutiny.

23. The present case, which involves misuse of public office, subversion of judicial process, and fraudulent deprivation of public trust property, clearly falls within this category of 'economic offences'.

24. In light of the above, this Court finds no merit in the present petitions. The gravity of the allegations, the nature of the roles attributed to the petitioners, the status of proclamation proceedings, and the broader impact on public confidence in institutional integrity, all mitigate against extending the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Consequently, both the petitions stand dismissed.

25. 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.

26. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

27. A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected case.

14.07.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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